

2064. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Robert P. Worren and other residents of St. Clair County, Mich., urging favorable action on the game refuge bill (H. R. 745); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2065. Also, memorial of the Romeo Monday Club, urging stringent restrictions on immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2066. By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Petition of the D'Auria-Murphy Post, No. 143, American Legion, passed at its meeting on March 26, 1924, opposing the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2067. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Italian societies of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing that part of the Johnson immigration bill that discriminates against southern European immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2068. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of the city council of Minneapolis, favoring the early enactment granting an increase in pay to employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2069. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of members of the Henry Friedman Lodge, No. 899, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Pawtucket, R. I., opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2070. By Mr. OLIVER of New York: Petition of a mass meeting held under the auspices of the D'Auria-Murphy Post, No. 143, American Legion, on March 26, 1924, protesting against the enactment of the Johnson bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2071. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Roy Davis and 19 other citizens of Versailles, Ill., favoring restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 29, 1924.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, whose name is our hope, whose service is our joy, whose love is our support, whose redemption is our eternal life; all honor, glory, and praise be unto Thee both now and ever. Open the fountains of mercy and wisdom, and clothe us with righteous energy and Godly virtue. Everything that concerns the strength and progress of the Nation or the broad interests of mankind depends upon the moral and spiritual measure possessed by Thy children. In Thee O Lord do we put our trust that good fathers, pure mothers, obedient children, just masters, and honest servants may more and more enrich society and save the world. Hallowed be Thy name, O Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CLAIM OF E. W. COLE FOR A SEAT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Elections, No. 2, submitted a report on the claim of E. W. Cole for a seat in the House of Representatives as Representative at Large from the State of Texas.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2168. An act for the relief of David C. Van Voorhis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1929. An act to refund to Clinton G. Edgar income tax erroneously and illegally collected;

S. 1790. An act for the relief of Herman O. Kruschke;

S. 350. An act to authorize the transfer of surplus books from the Navy Department to the Interior Department;

S. 1499. An act to promote the safety of passengers and employees upon railroads by prohibiting the use of wooden cars under certain circumstances;

S. 81. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Lexington*;

S. 362. An act for the relief of Frank Grygla;

S. 763. An act for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners, trading as Hastings Bros.;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Orin Thornton;

S. 2399. An act to provide and adjust penalties for violation of the navigation laws, and for other purposes;

S. 2299. An act to validate the payment of commutation of quarters, heat, and light under the act of April 16, 1918, and of rental and subsistence allowances under the act of June 10, 1922;

S. 2450. An act to amend section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved July 31, 1894;

S. 2146. An act to amend section 84 of the Penal Code of the United States;

S. 2147. An act to complete the construction of the Willow Creek ranger station, Montana; and

S. 2148. An act to empower certain officers, agents, and employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of William R. Bradley, former acting collector of internal revenue for South Carolina; and

H. R. 6623. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Youngstown & Ashtabula Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill (H. R. 7449) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2168. An act for the relief of David C. Van Voorhis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1929. An act to refund to Clinton G. Edgar income tax erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1790. An act for the relief of Herman O. Kruschke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 350. An act to authorize the transfer of surplus books from the Navy Department to the Interior Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1499. An act to promote the safety of passengers and employees upon railroads by prohibiting the use of wooden cars under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 81. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Lexington*; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 362. An act for the relief of Frank Grygla; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 763. An act for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners, trading as Hastings Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 606. An act for the relief of Orin Thornton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2399. An act to provide and adjust penalties for violation of the navigation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2299. An act to validate the payment of commutation of quarters, heat, and light under the act of April 16, 1918, and of rental and subsistence allowances under the act of June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2450. An act to amend section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved July 31, 1894; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2147. An act to complete the construction of the Willow Creek Ranger Station, Mont.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2148. An act to empower certain officers, agents, or employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

### ADDRESS OF HON. T. W. PHILLIPS, JR.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address delivered before the Men's Bible Class of the English Lutheran Church and representatives of Bible classes of other communions of Butler, Pa., by Hon. T. W. PHILLIPS, JR., a Member of the United States House of Representatives, as follows:

### PRINCIPLES.

The invitation to address the Men's Bible Class of the English Lutheran Church of Butler, Pa., and representatives from Bible classes of other communions is an honor which I greatly appreciate,

and I shall not transgress upon the proprieties of the occasion by introducing partisan politics. Furthermore, my devotion to the church and my loyalty to the state forbid me from attempting to compromise any church or any organization of any church through political activity or alliance. History teaches that the church can not as an organization enter politics without lessening its spiritual influence and without inviting disaster to the state. Nothing could be further from my thoughts and from my sense of the eternal fitness of things than to attempt by word or act to bring the church into politics or lean upon the church for preferment in politics, for standing in society, or for benefit in business. I am interested not in what I can get out of the church but rather in what I can put into the church.

I desire to assist the cause of religion by teaching faith, forbearance, and forgiveness, and by warning against fanaticism, which is conceived in superstition, nurtured on bigotry, and developed by intolerance. Since the dawn of history religious fanaticism has been the fruitful source of most horrible persecutions, enormities that have disgraced humanity. The pagans offered human sacrifices; the Mohammedans converted with the sword; the Jews crucified Jesus; Christians, so called, in turn tortured Jews, infidels, and each other. Even to-day religious discussion is inimical to friendship. While it is axiomatic that although two who differ may both be wrong, they can not both be right, yet so all powerful is the tyranny of training and tradition that many never attempt to reexamine with open minds the religious or political faith of their fathers. As a corollary to my attitude toward religion, I can truthfully say that I am not in politics with a desire to extract anything from it, but with the hope that I may contribute something to it. Otherwise I would be a slave to sentiment, and my position would be determined by pressure rather than by principle.

Religion is one of the greatest forces in human nature, but, unfortunately, it may be true or false; it may beautify or blemish; it may instill love or engender hate; it may inspire art or instigate atrocities; it may excite the loftiest emotions or obliterate every semblance of reason; it may lead high up on the mountain of clear vision or deep into the valley of superstition.

The "blood of the martyrs" may be the "seed of the church," but the martyrs obviously could not be the progenitors of succeeding generations; hence we are all handicapped by our heredity, for we have too much of the blood of the persecutors, the survivors, and too little of the blood of the persecuted, the exterminated. The first few years of our life was provincial in the extreme. We were surrounded by rigid family idiosyncrasies, by standardized social customs, and by religious prejudices, all of which created an environment, an atmosphere which we accepted as a matter of course and had no more thought of analyzing, of questioning, of criticizing it than the air we breathed. Our inborn intolerance and fanaticism therefore was augmented by our early life and education. Fanaticism and provincialism are enemies of diversity and individuality. Diversity and individuality produce progress; uniformity obtained by suppressing and discouraging individuality causes stagnation and decay.

That man has formidable handicaps is attested by the infinite toil and untold sacrifice connected with the slow rise of his several civilizations, also by their short duration and their rapid decline. That human government presents a real task is evidenced by the early history of the Israelites, the governing of whom seemed to tax the ingenuity of the Almighty. Morals, right living, and a spiritual concept of religion may be instilled through teaching and by example, but apparently can not be enforced and made permanent by legislation or edict, for otherwise a reign such as that of King Josiah, who destroyed the idols and slew all the priests of the high places, would have permanently regenerated the kingdom and secured for the people the undisputed and permanent control of their ancient heritage.

Under the beneficent administration of the judges there were no State taxes; the laws or rules of conduct were simple and therefore easily and equitably administered. "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." The people demanded a king. The kingdom developed along the lines of Asiatic despotism, with governmental agents or spies, high taxes, and official extravagance. The kingdom fell, but the now servile people submitted to a multiplicity of rules, laws, and interpretations which, according to Peter, became a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear."

Our Government is based upon a Constitution prepared with great deliberation by exceptionally able men, who benefited by the experience of Israel, Greece, Rome, France, and England. In the beginning our laws were prepared with precision and enacted only after careful consideration. The early legislators tried to follow Jefferson's maxim, "The best governed people are the least governed."

We, however, demand laws, more laws, and still more laws. A Pennsylvania colleague told me that a good lady in his district could not understand why there is so much lawbreaking and suggested that a law should be passed against it. The various States enact from 10,000 to 15,000 laws per year. We have sumptuary laws, class laws, and spite laws. We have Federal, State, and municipal judges by the thousands,

detectives and spies by the hundreds of thousands, and employees by the millions. We pay over \$7,000,000,000 per year in direct and indirect taxation, much of which is expended for the privilege of being governed, overgoverned, and misgoverned; all of which is not sufficient, for we insist upon having Senate investigating committees, House investigating committees, special investigating committees, beyond whose reach there is nothing, not even the private telegrams of the President. These investigating committees are little short of a "star chamber" or a "court of high commission" long since abolished in England. They are in effect courts of inquisition with power to summon anyone upon whom suspicion may rest or about whom an anonymous letter has been received. Witnesses are not protected by rules of evidence, and testimony irrelevant to the subject of inquiry may be introduced. Such a court is prosecutor, judge, and jury and is removed only one step from a mob which is prosecutor, judge, and jury and also executioner. Soon there will be nothing sacred, nothing confidential between priest and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client.

Under the leadership of Athens, when individuality was not suppressed by law or custom or education, intellectual development reached a plane never before equaled, never since excelled. Sparta enforced uniformity, for "he who did not reprove a fault that was committed in his presence and showed not his just resentment of it by a verbal correction was adjudged equally culpable with the guilty." Sparta left no literature and contributed nothing to future civilizations.

After the Asiatic spy system had been imported into the Roman Empire, Gibbon says:

"These official spies, who regularly corresponded with the palace, were encouraged by favor and reward anxiously to watch the progress of every treasonable design. Their careless or criminal violation of truth and justice was covered by the consecrated mask of zeal. The progress of the inquiry continually offered new subjects of criminal persecution."

In 1780 Edmund Burke said:

"A mercenary informer knows no distinction. Under such a system the obnoxious people are slaves. In this situation men not only shrink from the frowns of a stern magistrate but they are obliged to fly from their very species. The blood of wholesome kindred is infected. Their tables and beds are surrounded with snares. This species of universal subservency, that makes the very servant who waits behind your chair the arbiter of your life and fortune, has a tendency to degrade and abase mankind, and to deprive them of that assured and liberal state of mind which alone can make us what we ought to be."

Due, no doubt, to her liberal leaders and her colonial experience England became less oppressive, and either as a cause or coincidence the British Isles are far more free from crime than Germany, based upon pre-war statistics, where autocratic powers were exercised and tyrannical methods in vogue, and contrasts with the United States, where we seem to have a hit-and-miss—usually miss—method of dealing with crime. For instance, in 1922 there were only 28 murders committed in London, having a population of 8,000,000; while in the District of Columbia, having a population of 500,000, there were 38 murders, indicating that our Capital is 2,000 per cent more murderous than the British capital. During some years the total number of murders committed in the United States approximates 10,000. We are having entirely too much crime, too much lawbreaking of all kinds. Evidently there is something wrong with our heredity, our environment, our education, and our Government, because it must take a combination of several unfavorable conditions to produce such results. Heredity can be improved, environment made more wholesome, education conducted on a higher plane, and government made more respectable and therefore better respected. Good government is important, is essential for proper development, for it has much to do with health and happiness. It can encourage thrift and discourage the spendthrift, or it can destroy capital and create chaos. It can make it easy to do good and difficult to do wrong, but it never was intended to take the place of the home, where character should be formed, where honesty should be taught, and where honor should be instilled.

While no one can define metes and bounds for laws and state positively where salutary laws cease and harmful legislation begins, yet we can point out principles that should be followed and policies that should be avoided. Laws should be few, fair, and enforced impartially. Penalties should fit the offense. By attempting to make a felony out of a misdemeanor we lose our sense of proportion. The lawbreaker or criminal is a human being usually capable of reason, able to make comparison, and arouse resentment in his family and among his friends. If, therefore, he is subjected to violence or to severe punishment, punishment unmerited by the nature of the offense, both he and his friends feel that society should, and if within their power will, be made to suffer and pay for what they consider outrageous injustice. If laws are to be respected, they must be respectable laws, enacted by sincere and respectable representatives, enforced by respectable officials in a firm but respectable manner.

Theoretically all laws should be enforced or repealed. However, neither common sense nor competition prevail in the management of



government, as is the case with business corporations, whose rules as soon as antiquated are discarded, and regulations that prove detrimental are changed immediately. We have and probably always will have laws that the people will obey only when and where it has been decided that they are conducive to the interests of society. Many laws are generally unknown; still more are unnoticed; some are kept to be revived and enforced in times of disturbance or upon other proper occasions; other laws may grow obsolete although never formally abrogated. No great harm can come from the resurrection of obsolete laws unless their enforcement is undertaken by an official possessed with a zeal akin to that of a crusader or in case a wave of religious hysteria sweeps over a community. Matters of this kind are regulated by popular sentiment. The official will not take the initiative in enforcement unless backed by public sentiment, and the private informer will be deterred by expense, technical objections, ridicule, and contempt. When public sentiment crystallizes around any law it will be enforced, and it is therefore not only unnecessary but may result seriously if officers, spies, or private informers are permitted to profit from the assessment or collection of fines. Such a system results in false charges and frame-ups, depraves the informer, and creates resentment.

If the doctrine that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" is correct, and this is the American political philosophy, then it follows:

First. That government should be administered so as to promote the good of all the governed.

Second. That government should be administered so that it will be possible and easy to discover the best interests of the governed.

Third. That adequate provision should be made for the free expression by the people of their wishes.

Fourth. That when their wishes are made known they will be heeded by those in power. In such an extensive country, embracing a cosmopolitan population, having diversified interests, general good can be promoted, information secured, wishes expressed, and assurances given best through the mediums of responsible political parties. The replacement of party government by bloc government involves the substitution of government by minority groups for government by the majority of all the people. Party government implies government by consent. Bloc government is incipient sovietism and will lead to minority coercion.

The action of the state or government in a civilized community shapes itself into the threefold functions of legislation, judicature, and administration, and the complete separation of these three functions marks a high point in social organization. In a simple state of society the same officers discharge all the duties which we divide between the legislator, the administrator, and the judge. The whole question as to the sphere of government may be stated in these two questions: What should the state do for its citizens, and how far should the state interfere with the action of its citizens? There is a general presumption against the interference of government which is only to be overcome by very strong evidence of interest. Therefore the province or range of action of government should be clearly divided between essential powers or those that are absolutely necessary and constituent or subordinate functions which are not absolutely necessary for the self-preservation of the state but are always exercised to greater or less degree in modern states.

Essential powers of any government are those which are necessary in order to maintain a state as a sovereign independent body politic. For a state to maintain its independence and sovereignty it is absolutely essential that it should obtain sufficient means and exercise sufficient authority to not only protect itself from foreign invasion but also to maintain law and order within its domains and to protect all its citizens in their legal, their constitutional, their inalienable rights. While it is true that the essential powers of government may be exercised wisely or willfully, economically or extravagantly, there should be no question as to their being exercised; in fact, those in authority are morally bound, legally bound, and oath bound to maintain the essential powers of government and have no right to exercise discretion, except in a limited way, in regard to their application. That there is or can be such a thing as essential powers is evidently not generally understood, for otherwise lawlessness, which is largely due to the failure of our legislative or executive representatives in the Nation, in the various States, and in the municipalities to uphold the essential powers of government, would not be so general and so rapidly on the increase. If our Nation is to remain a free and sovereign State, the essential powers of government must be maintained at all hazards, regardless of cost.

The constituent or subordinate functions of government, while non-essential to the existence of the state, are important factors in the economic, physical, and moral welfare of the people, and are therefore exercised extensively by all civilized states. Under constituent functions of the United States Government are bureaus, commissions, departments, and a multiplicity of statute laws. Much of the disrespect for laws and the waste of millions of the taxpayers' money is due to failure to exercise judgment, discretion, and economy in expanding the constituent or subordinate functions of government, and since there is

no limit in these fields of activity, and since the people are constantly being misled by those who promise much for little or something for nothing, activity along these lines must be curtailed or we will soon have a paternalistic or socialistic government, brought about, perhaps indirectly, by taxing the farmer out of his farm, the business man out of his business, and the workingman out of his job. Some classes of taxpayers are given no consideration by many of the lawmakers, because they look upon taxation as primarily social legislation.

Taxes under Asiatic despots amounted in some instances to as much as 90 per cent of the taxpayers' production, which, of course, reduced them to the position of serfs or slaves. Under our Government, Federal taxes for several years past have in many instances amounted to 50 per cent of the income left after paying State and local taxes. Taxation is a real issue, a menace in every section of our country and throughout the entire world.

In a letter recently received from a classmate commending my position on this question, he states:

"In this section of the country you hear little talk but taxation. In fact, it has gotten to the point where the people just can not stand the burden. A man living in this city—Savannah, Ga.—has \$1,000 in a savings bank drawing 4 per cent interest.

The income therefrom is.....	\$40.00
Savannah city taxes.....	\$16.67
Chatham County taxes.....	17.50
State of Georgia.....	5.00
United States income tax.....	1.60
Total.....	40.77

"Excess of taxes over income, \$0.77.

"On a 4 per cent investment we must either beg, borrow, earn, or steal 77 cents to pay taxes."

Traditions and early training not only play a prominent part in religious affiliations, but also in political associations; but prejudice should not prevent a Republican legislator from giving most serious consideration to the principles of government as promulgated by Jefferson, the great exponent of democracy; nor should partisan zeal prevent a Democratic legislator from failing to note that the Democratic Presidents, Cleveland and Wilson, in times of crises discarded the Jeffersonian ideals and adopted the ideas of Hamilton, the patron saint of republicanism, who taught that solidarity and security were dependent upon placing preponderant power in the Federal Government.

Two of the purposes of our Government, as stated in the preamble of the Constitution, are: (1) "To promote the general welfare," and (2) "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to posterity." That general welfare and blessings are not, can not, be found either now or in the future in an overpopulated and underfed world or country is self-evident. Since our Government was founded the population of the world has more than doubled. The present increase is as great as at any time during the past, being approximately 12,000,000 per year, or 0.7 of 1 per cent. At this rate population doubles in 60 years, and, if maintained, our grandchildren would see 7,000,000,000. In the year 3000 A. D. the population would be 34,000,000,000. The land area of the earth, exclusive of the Arctic, includes 33,000,000,000 acres. In the most populous countries about 40 per cent of the land is cultivated. Just before the war Germany was tilling 1.15, France 1.05, Italy 0.98, and Belgium 0.57 acres per capita. None of these countries were self-supporting. Even Germany under the pressure of war could not live within herself. It requires about 2½ acres of cultivated land to support one person. Hence the world could support 5,200,000,000 people, and, at the present rate of increase, babies now alive will see 5,200,000,000 people living on a limited dietary.

At the present time much of Asia is crowded. Europe for the most part, except Russia, is overpopulated, and the fecundity of the Russian people is so great that with a few years of domestic tranquillity it would soon fill up. Canada is now gaining rapidly in population, and when it reaches 60,000,000 people it will cease to be a source of food supply for the United States and other countries. The tide of immigration is turning toward South America. It is not necessary to look into the remote future to see the day when the people in the United States will be compelled to rely upon their own food supply in lean years as well as in fat years. Between 1910 and 1920, 16 per cent was added to our country's population. At this rate the population would double in 44 years. In 1964 it would be 214,000,000, which is too many for health and happiness.

In the United States we have 1,903,000,000 acres of land, the ultimate disposition of which will be about as follows: Improved land, 800,000,000 acres; forest and wooded land, 360,000,000 acres; range land and unimproved pastures, 425,000,000 acres; desert, 238,000,000 acres; cities, roads, and railroads, 80,000,000 acres. In the above allotment less than 20 per cent is reserved for forest, although France retains about 25 per cent of her area in forest and still finds it necessary to import lumber. In Germany the proportion of wooded territory is even greater. Eight hundred million acres in a high state of cultiva-

tion, with no allowance for drought, might support 300,000,000 people, but the United States can better support, according to our standards, standards which we wish to maintain, 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 people.

If the population of the United States is allowed to increase to 200,000,000 or 300,000,000, meat diet (with the exception of fowls) will be one of the first luxuries to go. Food animals are a secondary product of agriculture, using up food not much more efficiently than human beings. It takes approximately eight times as much land to provide a man with a diet wholly of meat as it does to provide him with nourishment from vegetable sources.

We are trustees for our descendants, and if we do not treat our trusteeship seriously we have no moral right to leave descendants. If we hearken to those who demand 300,000,000 people in the United States, we are lost. Better have 150,000,000 people, or thereabouts, who can live comfortably and happily, if they will, than 300,000,000 chained permanently to poverty and distress. Our population should be limited to such a point where each person has not only a chance for pursuing happiness, but also the possibility of overtaking it. This problem should be solved by preventing it from ever becoming acute and implies not only restriction of immigration but rational birth control. The former is a governmental problem; the latter is a matter for education and advice devolving upon the medical and nursing professions as a primary duty. Safe and scientific contraceptive information should no longer be denied the millions of people who although diseased or defective become unwilling parents and whose descendants fill our institutions for the social inadequates. Children are the greatest assets of the Nation; in fact, in the last analysis they are the only assets that are really worth while. Everything that we have, all that was committed to our keeping by those who preceded us, must be intrusted to those who follow us for those who in turn follow them. It is therefore our supreme duty to endeavor to produce children of character, of courage, of capacity, and provide environment favorable for their development.

Early in his history man was condemned to work. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground." Man has ever endeavored and rightly to free himself from that curse by his ingenuity, by his inventions, by studying nature's laws and controlling nature's energy. Marvelous has been his progress, but still we toil and sweat. King David said:

"I have been young, and now I am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread."

This no doubt is a substantially correct statement of David's observation, but his experience was limited as to territory and confined to a period of expansion for his people. Certainly it could not be true in an overpopulated country. Jesus said:

"The poor always ye have with you."

This statement has been true in the past, is true now, and will be true in the future. It is permissible to reduce the amount of sweat that must be exchanged for bread, and it is commendable to mitigate poverty. Apparently it will be impossible to entirely eliminate poverty. The total of individual incomes in the United States is approximately \$60,000,000,000, or less than \$600 per capita per year. If the total income were equally distributed, an individual would receive less than one one-hundredth million of the proceeds of his own labor. Under such a system there would be little incentive to work, hence production would decrease and poverty would become uniform and universal. What might result in case of voluntary slavery is of no consequence, because it would presuppose an impossible condition. If we attempt to eliminate poverty through pensions, we increase idleness and improvidence by rewarding indolence, and soon there would be such an increase in the shirkers with a corresponding decrease in the workers that the system would result in moral as well as financial ruin. If conditions remain as they are, the poor will always be with us unless or until we can make the incompetent competent and the indolent industrious, thus increasing our production so that luxuries will be general and necessities universal.

We now have over a million and a half people who are defective to the extent that they need institutional care, between five and six million who are mentally only slightly above those who can properly be committed to institutions, and probably 10,000,000 whose intelligence is subnormal to such an extent that they can not be appraised as an industrial asset, and we also have a criminal class of no small proportion which seems to be rapidly increasing, as is also the defective class. If we attempt to equalize living conditions by taxing the intelligent and industrious for the benefit of the ignorant and indolent, births, already too few among the former class, would be further restricted, while births, already too frequent among the latter class, would be increased.

Whether economic conditions are satisfactory or unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of any particular class or group is a potent factor in reproduction. Even State pensions for the aged remove one of the greatest incentives for thrift, economy, and self-reliance. If those who were improvident are to be provided for out of the savings of those who

tolled and sacrificed there is little incentive to save. Furthermore, an elaborate system of State aid would relieve blood relatives from the duty, the necessity of caring for, and in case of death providing for their dependents. People should be encouraged, or perhaps compelled, to provide so far as possible against the day of misfortune, so that doles and pensions will be unnecessary.

It has been found, in fact it is within the range of the most casual observation, that those whose inherited abilities make them in some measure the more desirable members of society are continuously outbred by their less well-endowed fellow citizens. Investigation has shown that the greater the economic failure in life the younger the age of marriage, the higher the marriage rate, and also the higher the birth rate. In the future if the decrease in the birth rate takes place with greater speed among those who are our poorest national assets, the Nation is on the up grade; otherwise decay will follow because it is on the down grade. Births of white mothers per 1,000 in New York State, exclusive of New York City, in 1916 was:

Native	17.2
English, Scotch, and Welsh	19.1
Russian	88.6
Austro-Hungarian	89.9
Italian	91.6

Not only would unrestricted immigration overpopulate the United States in a very few years, but immigrants when admitted in great quantities tend to become segregated into racial groups, whose children for many generations remain alien in loyalty, in culture, and in spirit. American institutions and the language of the country are in disfavor where large groups of foreigners predominate. This is notable with the French in Louisiana, the Mexicans of Spanish descent in New Mexico, and other aliens in whole districts of our great cities of the North as well as in extensive rural sections in the Northwest.

A speech, like a lady's dress, should be short enough to be interesting and long enough to cover the subject. Mine, I fear, has been too long to be interesting, but even though it is not long enough to cover the subject, I will not detain you longer than to make a few general observations. If, as it has been said, "History is past politics, and politics is present history," then it is possible to insure good history by wise politics. Politics can rise to lofty statesmanship only if we make it possible for statesmanship to be good politics.

Our form of government was an experiment at the time Lincoln said:

"We are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

More than three score years have passed since that memorable address, and our Government, our theory of government, has still its severest tests before it. True, our material growth has been marvelous and so bewildering that it has beguiled us into the belief that all movement means advancement, and sometimes too much attention is directed toward movement with little attempt made to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." The danger of loss is ever present. More than 19 centuries ago the Son of Man announced that He "came to seek and to save that which was lost." It is not the loss of gems and jewels, of silver and gold, that need give us the most serious concern, but rather the loss of faith, hope, and love, the lowering of our standards—patriotic standards, political standards, social standards, ethical standards, moral standards.

Things that are seen are temporal, things that are unseen are eternal. The seen, the temporal, belong largely to the domain of the State. Things that are unseen, the spiritual, the eternal, belong exclusively to the realm of the church. If, therefore, we render "unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's," conditions will be favorable for the spiritual growth of the church and for the peaceful development of the State.

#### PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an article on legislation in regard to Brazilian coffee planting, by E. H. O'Brien.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask my colleague if that is incorporated in remarks of his own. If it is, I will not object.

Mr. LITTLE. No; this is the best article on Brazilian coffee planting I ever saw in the world, and I thought we ought to have the benefit of it. I can assure the gentleman it is very much up-to-date and very well worth while.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. And the gentleman wants to incorporate it as a part of his own remarks?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; in my extension.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. It is so nearly personal, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.



CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT  
APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on H. R. 6349, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up the conference report on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill (H. R. 6349). Does the gentleman desire the conference report to be read?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The conference report was read, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6349) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 10, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 42, 46, 48, and 49, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$31,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That no money herein appropriated for the enforcement of the national prohibition act, the customs laws, or internal revenue laws, shall be used to pay for storage in any private warehouse of intoxicating liquors or other property in connection therewith seized pursuant to said acts and necessary to be stored, where there is available for that purpose space in a Government warehouse or other suitable Government property in the judicial district wherein such property was seized, or in an adjacent judicial district, and when such seized property is stored in an adjacent district, the jurisdiction over such property in the district wherein it was seized shall not be affected thereby"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$14,416,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 1, 2, 43, and 44.

MARTIN S. MADDEN,

WM. S. VARE,

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

F. E. WARREN,

REED SMOOT,

LEE S. OVERMAN,

CARTER GLASS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6349) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

On No. 3: Strikes out the increase of \$2,500,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the customs service.

On Nos. 4 and 5: Strikes out the changes, proposed by the Senate, in the punctuation of the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau.

Nos. 6 and 7: Increases the appropriation for the office of Treasurer of the United States from \$1,080,000 to \$1,092,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 8: Increases the appropriation for collectors of internal revenue, deputy collectors, gaugers, etc., from \$3,800,000 to \$3,900,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 9: Appropriates \$31,735,000 instead of \$31,235,000, as proposed by the House, and \$32,235,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the collection of internal-revenue taxes.

On Nos. 10 and 11, relating to appropriations for enforcement of the national prohibition act: Strikes out the limitation, inserted by the Senate, upon the expenditure of funds in connection with certain violations of the act, and inserts a substitute for the language proposed by the Senate and the House relative to the storage in Government warehouses of liquor and other property seized in connection with violations.

On No. 12: Increases the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes from \$425,000 to \$433,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 13 and 14, relating to the Public Health Service: Makes the appropriation for "prevention of epidemics" available for the purchase of newspapers and clippings containing information relating to the prevalence of disease; and appropriates \$149,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House, for the division of venereal diseases.

On No. 15: Strikes out the increase of \$1,280, proposed by the Senate, for wages of employees in the New Orleans Mint.

On Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, relating to public buildings: Appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$145,000, as proposed by the House, for the National Leprosarium; increases the amount authorized to be expended for a site at Fairmont, Minn., from \$10,000 to \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for an underground passage connecting the subtreasury and the assay office at New York; and increases, as proposed by the Senate, from \$350,000 to \$400,000, the amount for remodeling public buildings.

On Nos. 20 to 26, inclusive, relating to construction work at marine hospitals: Strikes out the appropriations, inserted by the Senate, for improvement of marine hospitals at the following places: Boston, Mass., \$31,000; Chicago, Ill., \$60,000; Fort Stanton, N. Mex., \$50,000; New Orleans, La., \$15,000; Portland, Me., \$6,000; San Francisco, Calif., \$12,000; and appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$31,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the marine hospital at Carville, La.

On Nos. 27 to 32, inclusive, relating to quarantine stations: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for improvements at quarantine stations at the following places: Astoria, Oreg., \$4,000; Galveston, Tex., \$7,350; Gulf, Miss., \$8,250; Reedy Island, Del., \$3,500; San Francisco, Calif., \$3,000; and San Juan, P. R., \$3,500.

On No. 33: Appropriates \$85,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, for vaults and safes at public buildings.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

On No. 34: Appropriates \$213,740, as proposed by the House, instead of \$219,740, as proposed by the Senate, for the office of the Postmaster General.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$387,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$396,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General.

On No. 36: Restores the limitation, stricken out by the Senate, fixing the number of persons who may be employed in certain grades under the classification act.

On No. 37: Appropriates \$455,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$445,000, as proposed by the House, for traveling expenses of inspectors.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$5,759,150, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,600,000, as proposed by the House, for watchmen, messengers, and laborers in post offices.

On No. 39: Appropriates \$4,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for allowances to third-class post offices for clerical services.

On No. 40: Appropriates \$14,416,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,000,000, as proposed by the House, for rent, light, and fuel for first, second, and third class post offices; and strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, for the monthly payment of rental for post-office premises.

On No. 41: Appropriates \$925,000, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House and \$935,000 as proposed by the Senate, for miscellaneous items at first and second class post offices.

On No. 42: Appropriates \$980,000, as proposed by the Senate. Instead of \$950,000, as proposed by the House, for car fare and bicycle allowances.

On No. 45: Appropriates \$7,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, for transportation of foreign mails.

On No. 46: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the certificate of approval of the Postmaster General to expenses of delegates to the Universal Postal Congress at Stockholm shall be conclusive on the accounting officers.

On No. 47: Strikes out the increase of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate for mechanical appliances; and strikes out the authority inserted by the Senate for services of engineering and technical personnel engaged in research activities.

On No. 48: Appropriates \$1,960,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,750,000, as proposed by the House, for mail bags and mail containers.

On No. 49: Reduces from \$500,000 to \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount to be made immediately available from the appropriation for Rural Delivery Service.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

Nos. 1 and 2, relating to the Undersecretary of the Treasury.  
Nos. 43 and 44, appropriating \$3,000,000 for the Air Mail Service.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,  
WM. S. VARE,  
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the amount of the bill as passed by the Senate was \$738,369,880.25. The amount of the bill as passed by the House was \$729,950,950.25. The amount added by the Senate was \$8,418,930.

The amount of the House recessions in conference are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.	
Treasurer's office, salaries	\$12,000
Collectors of internal revenue, deputy collectors, gaugers, etc.	100,000
Collecting internal revenue	500,000
Secret Service, Treasury	8,800
Veneral diseases	124,000
National Leprosarium	5,000
New York subtreasury and assay office, connection	20,000
Remodeling buildings	50,000
Astoria quarantine station	4,000
Galveston quarantine station	7,350
Gulf, Miss., quarantine station	8,250
Ready Island quarantine station	3,500
San Francisco quarantine station	3,000
San Juan, Porto Rico, quarantine station	3,500
Vaults and safe, public buildings	10,000
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.	
Travel of inspectors	10,000
Laborers at post offices	159,150
Rent, light, etc.	416,600
Miscellaneous items	25,000
Car fare and bicycle allowance	30,000
Mail bags	210,000

The House recessions amount in the aggregate to \$1,710,150.

The Senate receded from the following items:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.	
Customs Service	\$2,500,000.00
Collecting internal revenue	500,000.00
New Orleans Mint	1,280.00
Carville, La., marine hospital	6,000.00
Boston marine hospital	31,000.00
Chicago marine hospital	60,000.00
Fort Stanton, N. Mex., marine hospital	50,000.00
New Orleans marine hospital	15,000.00
Portland marine hospital	6,000.00
San Francisco marine hospital	12,000.00
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.	
Postmaster General's office, salaries	6,000.00
First Assistant's office, salaries	9,000.00
Allowances to third-class offices	100,000.00
Miscellaneous expenses	10,000.00
Transportation of foreign mail	300,000.00
Mechanical appliances, engineering research	100,000.00

Total Senate recessions 3,706,280.00

Items brought back for separate votes:	
Undersecretary of the Treasury	2,500.00
Air Mail Service	3,000,000.00
	3,002,500.00

Concurrence will be asked in the amount of \$2,500 for Undersecretary and \$2,750,000 for Air Mail Service. If these are adopted, the recessions will stand as follows:

House recessions	4,462,650.00
Senate recessions	3,956,280.00
The total for the bill will then stand	734,413,600.25
The bill as passed the Senate exceeded the Budget estimates	3,063,731.75
The bill as agreed upon will be less than the Budget estimates by	892,548.25

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If I understand the gentleman's report, the House recessions amount to \$4,450,000?

Mr. MADDEN. But that includes the \$2,750,000 for the air mail.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, the Senate has forced the House to add \$4,450,000 to this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and the Senate receded from \$3,956,280.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, is not that what always happens in connection with all of these bills?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. They are added to in large sums?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The net amount added to the bill is \$3,956,280, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. That is the amount of the recessions?

Mr. MADDEN. That is what the Senate receded from.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. What is the net addition made by the Senate?

Mr. MADDEN. The House receded from \$4,462,650, and that is the amount that is added.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The Senate made a very appreciable recession, did it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. If it had not been for the air mail, we would have had most of the money off.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. There is one more question I would like to ask the gentleman. As I understand from the report, the Senate receded on amendment No. 10, on page 21?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am sorry on principle they made that recession.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman with reference to an appropriation of \$500,000 made immediately available for rural service.

Mr. MADDEN. That was changed to \$300,000. They said they could not use more than \$300,000 between now and the 1st of July for rural service.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the Post Office Department thought that was adequate?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 9, after \$12,000 insert "Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall hereafter receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum, and shall perform such duties in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law, and under the provisions of section 177, Revised Statutes, in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease, \$10,000."

Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lines 1 and 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "Fiscal Assistant Secretary," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Undersecretary." And in line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the words "and" insert the word "hereafter"; and in line 10 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Treasury," insert "hereafter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I take it for granted that this may be properly designated an administration bill.

Mr. MADDEN. It is an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. An administration appropriation bill. It being an administration bill, does not the gentleman really think that he ought to have enough administration Members here to put it over?

Mr. MADDEN. This is for the support of the entire Government, we have but one vote to take, and it will only take five



minutes to settle this question. It has already been considered in the House.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I am not going to make the suggestion that the gentleman thinks I am. [Laughter.] I am only going to suggest to him the propriety of keeping enough Members here to enact legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed an appropriation for this additional office in the Treasury Department. It has repeatedly come up in the House and always gone out on a point of order, but each time it has been put back in the Senate. There is one feature of this proposed amendment that I very much approve of, and that is if we are going to have such an office it ought to be established by permanent law. That is what the amendment of the Senate proposes to do. I am not prepared to say that they do not need such a fiscal officer in the Treasury Department, in view of the fact that one of the conferees of the Senate was a former Secretary of the Treasury, and he insists, as well as other Senators, that this fiscal officer is needed. Therefore I interpose no further objection, except to register my position as to the creation of this office, especially since the House has repeatedly approved the proposal by adopting the Senate amendment at previous sessions of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 13, strike out the figures "\$163,780; in all, \$175,780" and insert the figures "\$156,280; in all, \$175,280."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 60, after line 3, insert "For the operation and maintenance of the airplane mail service between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Nebr., including necessary incidental expenses and employment of necessary personnel, \$1,500,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 60, after line 8, insert: "For an additional amount for the installation, equipment, and operation of the airplane mail service by night flying, and to enable the department to make the additional charges for both night and day service on first-class mail matter, in accordance with existing law, \$1,500,000."

Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 44 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the sum \$1,250,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter a protest against this infamous proposal for night flying in the air. That is all I can do—is to register my vote.

The motion was agreed to.

#### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7877) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening an amendment was pending which had been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition on that amendment, but I understand that first the gentleman

from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has a matter which he desires to present and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire recognition by unanimous consent to speak for five minutes on my amendment, because as soon as I had offered the amendment last evening and the argument had been made the committee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in amending the bill now under consideration, because one paragraph of the bill is printed so closely to another paragraph that the two became confused, and unintentionally there was stricken from the bill an item which should have been left in. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to return to page 79, line 20, for the purpose of reincorporating in the bill line 20 and the succeeding lines down to and including line 2 on page 80.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I can not agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that the point of order was inadvertently made. Possibly that might apply to the one made by him, but it does not apply to the point of order that I made. If the gentleman from Kentucky had not made his point of order, mine would have been lodged, and the paragraph would have gone out just the same. Knowing that I would have made the point of order, I can not agree to returning to the paragraph at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I trust the Senate will reinstate it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes with reference to the amendment which I offered last evening.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the committee has consumed no time on this amendment. I asked the gentleman whether it would be satisfactory if he should have this five minutes additional, and that then there should be 10 minutes more of debate, and that then debate on the paragraph and all amendments should close.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So far as I am concerned, that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

[By unanimous consent Mr. FITZGERALD was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we have under consideration the item for subsistence of the members of the central branch of the soldiers' home at Dayton, Ohio. The standard of subsistence is now so low that my mail is crowded with complaints and petitions about the vile treatment which the soldiers of the World War are getting in the tubercular hospitals and which the old soldiers are getting both in the hospitals and at the mess. The purpose of my amendment is not only to restore the present standard, which is intolerable, but to add 3 cents more a day to the mess of these soldiers of the Civil, Spanish, and the World Wars. Up to February of last year the soldiers of the Civil War were in the majority; now they constitute only 42 per cent of the 13,446 members of the 10 branches of the home. The amendment is to substitute \$411,740 for the amount suggested by the committee, \$353,460.

As I stated on Saturday last, an irresponsible attaché of the Budget Bureau deliberately lopped off more than \$600,000 from the estimates for the soldiers' homes which had been reprepared. After an estimate has been made of what it would cost to feed these soldiers on a decent wholesome diet, they were compelled to submit other figures to the Budget, and then this officer lopped off \$600,000 after they had submitted the irreducible minimum. I would say for the committee that I think it went as far as it dared to go in putting back some \$200,000 in this bill for the soldiers' homes, and that without the consent of the House and the knowledge of the facts, I doubt if the committee would take the responsibility of putting back the standard to what it ought to be.

I have before me, and I shall extend it in full, a letter which I received from General Hines this morning, because in conferring with the chairman of the subcommittee he told me that he was under the impression that 40 per cent of the World War men were going to be withdrawn from the soldiers' home hospitals. General Hines puts it in writing after having told me twice that that was an error, and this morning in this letter which he sent down specially he says:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,  
Washington, March 28, 1924.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: Concerning the statement alleged to have been made by Congressman ANTHONY, to the effect that 40 per cent of Veterans' Bureau patients were being removed from soldiers' homes, I desire to inform you that any such statement, if made, was in error, as there has been no order issued by this bureau for any such procedure. However, in the National Soldiers' Home, Leavenworth, Kans., there were a few patients suffering with tuberculosis. Some time ago the bureau allotted to the National Soldiers' Home \$20,000 to make certain alterations and necessary repairs which would fit that institution for the care of tuberculous patients. Up to the present time these alterations and repairs have not been completed, and, on the advice of General Wood, president Board of Managers National Soldiers' Home, and the district inspector, that it was inadvisable to hospitalize patients suffering with tuberculosis at that institution until these changes were made, those patients at that institution were transferred to other Government hospitals. As soon as the alterations referred to above have been completed and a staff secured for that hospital it will be utilized for the care of beneficiaries of this bureau suffering from tuberculosis.

We have at Tuskegee, Ala., a hospital for the care of colored beneficiaries of this bureau. This hospital is staffed almost entirely by colored physicians. It is desired to offer hospitalization to all colored beneficiaries in need of treatment for tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric diseases at that institution. With this in view, a canvass has been made of several hospitals, including National Soldiers' Home at Marlon, Ind., having in mind the transfer of those claimants who will accept transfer to Tuskegee. It is possible that the statement referred to above had reference to the movement of these patients.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Director.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman is in error. I never made the statement with which I seem to be credited, to the effect that 40 per cent of the Veterans' Bureau patients were to be removed. I told the gentleman the estimate was based upon the probable showing by the Veterans' Bureau of an increase of 40,000 patient days, and that the information we have was that they probably would not use that amount.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The chairman understands that I am not blaming him at all in the matter. I think the chairman may have intended to say that, but I made a special note of it at the time. Possibly the gentleman under a misapprehension may have stated it wrongly, or perhaps my understanding was a little obtuse. I made a note of it at the time and presented it immediately to the Veterans' Bureau, to find out that neither one of these circumstances will be true. The subcommittee has been improperly informed. In this letter there is a circumstance which possibly gave rise to that in the possible transfer of some of the patients at Leavenworth, Kans. There is no basis for any reduction of the number of men who are going to be fed at the Central Branch of the National Military Home.

The general treasurer, Col. C. W. Wadsworth, has told me since the estimates were sent in that the hospital is filled up, and there is no possibility of any reduction so far as can be seen, and that the estimates we have made are inadequate in themselves and are known to be. This morning I have two protests from camps of Spanish War veterans, which I shall incorporate in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I now read the letter of March 21 from Colonel Liscum Camp, No. 7, United Spanish War Veterans, as follows:

COLONEL LISCUM CAMP, No. 7,  
DEPARTMENT OF OHIO, UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,  
Dayton, Ohio, March 21, 1924.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: At a meeting of Colonel Liscum Camp, No. 7, Department of Ohio, a committee which had been appointed to always keep in touch with the comrades who are quartered at the Central Branch of the National Military Home, Dayton, Ohio, reported

on the subject of the reduction in the appropriations, which has caused considerable discussion in all parts of the United States. Those of you who have kept in close touch with cost of the upkeep of a soldier per day no doubt think that General Wood, president of the national board, in his statement that it was a low estimate when he quoted 37 cents per ration per member, was mistaken. While he no doubt based this upon a general average more minute details can be given.

There are 1,200 old veterans—Civil War and Spanish war—who eat at the general mess at a minimum cost of 22½ cents each; at the Franklin mess, where there are 150 members who are invalid cripples, their maintenance was 25½ cents each; the Harris mess, where there are principally Civil War veterans—80 of whom are blind—the rate was 24½ cents, with a membership of about 160. The general hospital averages about 29½ cents each; annex No. 1, 53½ cents; annex No. 3, 39½ cents; and annex No. 4, where only tuberculosis patients are quartered, about 60½ cents.

So it can be plainly seen by these figures that it would cause an awful hardship to all the members, and especially the general mess, where the largest majority of the old Civil War veterans and Spanish war veterans subsist.

At the meeting it was resolved to forward this letter to you and ask you on behalf of the comrades of this camp and of thousands of sympathizers of the disabled soldiers who fought that the flag should float over this country of the free, that you put forth your best efforts in behalf of the comrades. Why should the poor veterans' staff of life be taken away from him? Have the Congressmen lost all their reasoning power that they must reduce Government expenses by taking bread from the soldiers' mouths? \* \* \*

Trusting you will look into this matter in a true Christian light, and knowing full well that you are a champion of the veterans, and wishing you success, we are,

Very truly yours,

COLONEL LISCUM CAMP, No. 7,  
GEORGE HESSEMAN, Commander.  
FRANK KNOX, Adjutant.

The second letter is an equally indignant protest from Major William McKinley Camp, No. 91, of United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the matter of making up the appropriation for the soldier homes is one of exceeding difficulty this year, due to the requirements we inserted in this bill last year that beginning this year all money for the conduct of soldier homes, both for taking care of the regular members of those homes as well as the patients that are placed in the homes by the Veterans' Bureau, must be estimated for by the Budget and passed upon by the House and inserted in this bill. The conditions that have existed for the last three or four years have been that the House has been making partial appropriations for the maintenance of these homes, and these funds have been augmented by large lump sums turned over by the Veterans' Bureau to the soldiers' homes authorities, over which Congress has had no control or any knowledge whatever as to whether the amounts were necessary and were over or under the required amount. We are making an effort this year to put these appropriations, as I said, for the first time in several years on a business basis. The committee found in the investigation that the amount asked for by the Bureau of the Budget would not be sufficient, in our opinion, properly to subsidize or properly operate the homes this year. The Budget has contended very strongly that the amounts are sufficient, but we were inclined to give to Mr. FITZGERALD and other Members of the House, representing districts where these homes are located, the benefit of the doubt, so that we have increased the appropriations largely for subsistence, several hundred thousand dollars over the Budget, because first it is the desire of the committee, and knowing it to be also the desire of the House, that the men who are in these homes shall be subsisted not only well but liberally, and under the provisions in the bill that will be accomplished. The case presented to the House by the gentleman from Ohio is one that should have the attention of the proper authorities. I have gone very carefully into the petition that was read by the gentleman from Ohio the other day. What does it say? It is not an indictment of Congress for having made insufficient appropriations. It refers to conditions in regard to subsistence during the current year, and yet the soldiers' home there had all the money in the world it could use. There was no restraint of Congress upon the amount it could use for subsistence. They could put their hands in the United States Treasury clear up to the limit and get every dollar they needed. What are the complaints? The petition cites that the food was improperly cooked, was unfit for consumption, and that the eggs were rotten, and other things of that kind. In my opinion the officials of Mr. FITZGERALD's home, some of them, at least, are incom-



petent properly to administer the home and look after the expenditure of the money we appropriate, and the remedy is to go after the officers of his local home and see that they secure a competent commissary officer, and let him properly prepare the pure food which Congress provides.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. In just a second. I have had a good deal of experience in matters of this kind, and I know the United States Government buys for the Army and Navy and soldiers' homes and all public institutions the very best food that it is possible to buy in the market. It is rigidly inspected, and if they have the proper commissary officer it is sure to be of the very best quality.

You can take two different institutions, or two company organizations in the Army, and give them exactly the same raw material, the same food, and one company may have a good cook that understands his business and the other company may have a bad cook, and the company with the bad cook will be constantly growling and have reasons for complaint, whereas you would not hear one word of complaint from the other company that has the good cook. So I am satisfied that the responsibility for these complaints rests with the local officers, and that the gentleman will find his remedy at home—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state who is directly responsible for the conditions to which the gentleman has referred at the Dayton Home?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say that the officers at the Dayton Home are responsible.

Mr. DYER. Who are they?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know the names of the officers.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman ought to know; he is chairman of the committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know the names of all the local officers of these homes. The gentleman from Ohio undoubtedly knows, but I will say this: That if there was any officer at the Western Branch of the Soldiers' Home, located at my home town, responsible for the men getting bad food or rotten eggs I would raise the very devil until I had that fellow kicked out of the home and a proper man put in.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know the commanding officer at the Dayton Home is General Wood?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; he is president of the Board of Managers. The local governor is the local officer in charge.

Mr. DYER. Who is the one in command?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know his name.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman how much it costs for subsistence per capita at these homes?

Mr. ANTHONY. The average cost at Dayton, Ohio, including the general mess and the hospital, is 35 cents a day. The highest is for tubercular cases in the hospital—65 cents a day—and then we have 25 or 26 cents for the general mess. That is for the food alone.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman says the cost for tubercular cases is about 65 cents a day?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is in this particular soldiers' home. The fact that the Veterans' Bureau waste their money and let these costs run up to 90 cents a day is no reason why we should follow this extravagance on the part of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would the proper procedure be for the House to have a committee to investigate the matter? We can not get at it in any other way.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think this is only a local trouble, and I think the publicity given to it here in the committee and by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] will serve to correct the situation.

Mr. STEPHENS. I have received other complaints about the management of the home. I do not know how to get at it unless we have some committee to investigate.

Mr. ANTHONY. On the whole, I will say to the gentleman that while the head of the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Home is General Wood, a prominent Ohio Democrat, I have every reason to believe that he is an efficient official of the

Government, and that he will be glad to remedy these situations if they are pointed out to him.

Mr. DYER. That same statement has been made for several years; but annually we have such complaints, and nothing is done.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that I found on one occasion that they did not feed the veteran soldiers at the soldiers' home butter but were feeding them oleomargarine instead. I called the attention of the House to the fact, and the situation was remedied. Whenever these complaints are made they are remedied.

Mr. DYER. General Wood has been there for many years, and he has been kept there through influence at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. STENGLE. The gentleman has had considerable experience in handling these matters. I would like to have his opinion as to whether 25 or 26 cents a day under the present living costs is sufficient to feed a poor soldier.

Mr. ANTHONY. When we speak of the cost of the rations at all these places it means simply cost of the raw food. The cost of the labor and handling of it incident to its preparation is taken care of and paid out of another appropriation. In my judgment, in a public institution that is well and economically managed a very high standard of living can be maintained at a cost of 30 cents a day for the raw material where you find two or three thousand men under the same roof.

Mr. STENGLE. Well, in the State of Delaware, for example, in the workhouse, where they feed prisoners, they allow 60 cents a day.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; but you do not know how much of that goes for food and how much of it goes for other things. The committee has increased the amount asked for by the Budget Bureau to the exact figures that General Wood states he would spend this year for subsistence.

Now, what is the situation there? The number present for duty was 2,200, showing a decrease during the year of 224. The committee had evidence from the Veterans' Bureau and from the Budget Bureau to show that that number would not be increased during the coming year, but would be probably decreased, unless the contract hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., was abandoned and some of the men might be removed from there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is the idea of the committee to provide all the money that is needed for subsistence. If this should not be enough money, the Board of Managers undoubtedly will ask for a deficiency to make up any shortage, and in the bill considered in the House yesterday there was an item for that very purpose, increasing the amount to subsist one of these homes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. General Wood has said that under the orders of the Budget Bureau he can not create a deficiency when all the facts are presented to this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ANTHONY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 32, noes 44.

The CHAIRMAN. The noes have it; the amendment is rejected. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital: For pay of medical officers—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. ANTHONY. The point comes too late.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman ask for tellers or not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I asked for tellers immediately.

Mr. ANTHONY. It comes too late. The gentleman can not control the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Ohio will state that at the time the Clerk began to read he was on his feet demanding tellers, the Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I rose immediately when the Chair announced the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman was on his feet when the Clerk began to read?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I rose as soon as I heard the announcement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, there was no time elapsing between the announcement of the Chair and the time when the Clerk began to read. It was almost simultaneous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not wish to be arbitrary.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time waiting for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question. Those in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] A sufficient number have arisen.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. FITZGERALD to act as tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] will pass between the tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital: For pay of medical officers and assistant surgeons, matrons, druggists, hospital clerks and stewards, ward masters, nurses, cooks, waiters, readers, drivers, funeral escort, janitors, and for such other services as may be necessary for the care of the sick; burial of the dead, surgical instruments and appliances, medical books, medicine, liquors, fruits, and other necessities for the sick not purchased under subsistence; bedsteads, bedding, and all other special articles necessary for the wards; hospital furniture, including special articles and appliances for hospital kitchen and dining room; carriage, hearse, stretchers, coffins; and for all repairs to hospital furniture and appliances not done by the home, \$260,528.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 96, line 18, for the figures "\$260,528" substitute "\$274,228."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FITZGERALD: Page 96, line 18, strike out "\$260,528" and insert in lieu thereof "\$274,228."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, complaints have not only been made in regard to the subsistence and food but also as to the filthy and vile conditions in which these old veterans of the Civil War and the helpless men of the Spanish War are kept in these hospitals. I read on Saturday a letter from one of these men, supported by the statements of three eminent business men of my city to the effect that he was worthy of belief. I submitted the letter to the president of the Board of Managers, and he says this man's statement is entitled to belief; this soldier states that he had formerly made complaints and that an inspector from the War Department had come there as a result of one of his complaints and an entire ward of one of the hospitals was torn down.

He said he was forced to sleep in Company 7 between two old men who could not control their bowels or their water, and that they were forced to lie in filthy condition for 8 or 10 days at a time.

You can not tell me that is because the Democratic official at the head of the home wants such a condition to prevail, and I do not charge any Democrat or Republican with wanting any such condition as that to prevail or continue.

By reason of this vile and filthy condition this man's stomach was turned and he could not stay and eat there; although both of his legs are off he had to leave the soldiers' home on account of the revolting conditions.

They have one-third of the attendants at this hospital required by the standard of hospitals in the United States—just one-third, and that in face of the fact that most of these old men are in such a condition that they are hospital patients now and have little hope of ever being anything else.

This man had to sit across the table from a man whose face was almost eaten off with cancer; he complained to the surgeon and he was sent to the hospital, where he died, a Spanish War soldier by the name of Benson.

I say these hospital conditions are intolerable, and when they ask for just a sufficient amount to maintain the present loathsome conditions what I ask you to do is to increase the amount and keep it no viler than it is.

Mr. WOLFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. WOLFF. I wish to state to the gentleman that several months ago I introduced a resolution in this House touching that very condition. I asked for an investigation of these hospitals, but the chairman of the Rules Committee of this House informed me they did not want an investigation there. I know that the conditions which the gentleman from Ohio mentions exist there; that men with venereal diseases are handling the food and waiting on men who are sick in one of the hospitals; but they do not want those conditions investigated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The conditions are revolting now under the present standard, and I say to you that the Speaker of this House has prevented my attempts to get the reports of the soldiers' homes published for the last three years. This Congress alone is responsible, because no department of the Government has any supervision or control or charge over this Board of Managers. They must come to Congress and ask for the necessary money and ask us to create the proper standard to care for these old men. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, for the hospital at the Dayton Branch Home, to which the gentleman refers, there is appropriated \$260,528 for the next fiscal year. This is the exact amount of the Budget estimate, and it is \$15,000 more than was expended there the year before.

The number of beds in the hospital is 1,330, of which 286 are vacant at the present time. I find there is provision in this appropriation to employ 415 civilian attendants, which means nurses and attendants upon these sick men. That would mean that these attendants would have, on the average, two patients to look after, so it would seem to me the hospital is at least fully manned with that number of civilian attendants provided for.

If the conditions to which the gentleman from Ohio refers are true, they are deplorable and should be taken up for investigation by the proper authorities. It is obvious, of course, that it is a situation over which this committee has no authority.

But the committee would be glad to provide every facility in its power for a proper investigation of conditions. However, I am surprised that a gentleman who is as close as the gentleman from Ohio seems to be to General Wood, the president of the Board of Managers, would permit conditions like that to exist without bringing them to the attention of the proper committees of the House. I want to assure the House that if conditions such as the gentleman has explained to the House had been brought to the attention of this committee at any of its formal hearings, they certainly would have had full, thorough, and complete investigation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is it entirely true, as the gentleman from Ohio says, that the board of control is responsible to no official or department of the Government?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the law which created the national homes it was intended to divorce them from the control of any Government department, from political control, you might say, and that control is vested in a board of managers which is named by Congress, and that board has absolute authority.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. To whom is that board responsible? To whom does it make its reports? Is there no one connected with the Government to whom it makes reports, and no one who has a right to overlook it and suggest changes?

Mr. ANTHONY. It makes a report to Congress each year. The homes are inspected by the War Department, by the Inspector General of the Army each year, and, as far as I know, there are no official reports showing any such conditions to prevail as the gentleman has set forth.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am prepared to believe that, but one would gather from what has been said that although there may be inspections and oversight, there is no authority resting anywhere to bring about any changes.

Mr. ANTHONY. In my judgment, if what the gentleman from Ohio has said is halfway true, then what is needed there is a complete cleaning out of the official force at the Dayton Home, but it is evident, of course, that this committee has no control over that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Board of Managers are cognizant of these facts, as you know. I did appear before your committee and told you that I had these things. General Wood was there testifying, and nothing was known as to whether



the committee would give them the estimates they wanted or not. These conditions in the hospital are going to be worse instead of better during the next year, according to the testimony of General Wood, even if you gave him all he asked to maintain the present standard.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman think any amount of money we could appropriate would excuse the maltreatment of the veterans such as you describe?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; because I know they are shorthanded—

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not believe that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know they are shorthanded. I know they can not get the proper help. I know they pay men who are not competent to do these things—sick men themselves, who try to look after other sick men. I know because they are sick they are impatient and neglectful of their duties.

Mr. ANTHONY. What would be the judgment of the gentleman in the matter? This is a hospital with a thousand patients, and we provide for 415 civilian attendants and for \$15,000 more in money than they had the year before, with a hospital attendance that will probably grow less instead of greater. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would suggest you really do what you say you are doing and what I say to this House you are not doing. I say to you that you have been providing only one employee for every three or four patients, which means not only the nurses and the individual attendants for the sick but covers the hospital clerks, the stewards, and every janitor and employee about the institution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 31, noes 33.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. ANTHONY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 49, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Farm: For pay of farmer, chief gardener, harness makers, farm hands, gardeners, horseshoers, stablemen, teamsters, dairymen, herders, and laborers; tools, appliances, and materials required for farm, garden, and dairy work; grain and grain products, hay, straw, fertilizers, seed, carriages, wagons, carts, and other conveyances; animals purchased for stock or work (including animals in the park); gasoline; materials, tools, and labor for flower garden, lawn, park, and cemetery; and construction of roads and walks, and repairs not done by the home, \$22,350.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this bill makes provision for the harbors of the Nation. It appropriates as follows:

To be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and other boundary and connecting waters between the said lake and Lake Superior, Lake Champlain, and the natural navigable waters embraced in the navigation system of the New York canals, including all necessary expenses for preparing, correcting, extending, printing, binding, and issuing charts and bulletins, and of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation; and for the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, for pay of inspectors, deputy inspectors, crews, and office force, and for maintenance of patrol fleet and expenses of office, \$37,250,000.

This money is to be expended by the Chief of Engineers of the Army for projects already approved and mostly already more or less completed. I am interested in the provision made for harbor work in various ports of the Nation, since we need to do all we can to develop the maritime interests of the Nation. I am especially interested in the work about and in the Baltimore Harbor, because the municipality itself has started the expenditure of \$50,000,000 for the development of its splendid port.

The cost of maintenance of the Baltimore Channel is very small compared with other ports, as, for example, Philadelphia. Note the following statement of General Taylor, Assistant Chief of Engineers:

#### BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD.

##### IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE.

Mr. DICKINSON. The next project is Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md., for which you are asking \$200,000 for improvement and \$300,000 for maintenance, with a tonnage of 13,000,000.

General TAYLOR. That project is the exact opposite of Philadelphia so far as ease of maintenance is concerned. There has been very little maintenance work in Baltimore Harbor for several years. During that time, however, there has been a considerable accumulation of shoaling in the channels, so it will now take a considerable sum to get that out. But the average cost of maintenance of that channel is very small compared with the cost of the Philadelphia project. The estimated cost, for example, is \$150,000 a year.

Mr. DICKINSON. Reference is made here to an extension of an additional area, including Mud Island. Is that going to involve additional expense?

General TAYLOR. No, sir. On the contrary, that was put in for the purpose of decreasing the cost. It was thought quite possible that in connection with the dredging in the channel it would be possible to fill certain areas of land by tide flats, and that the owners of those tide flats would provide bulkheads and do other work necessary to permit of economically filling that area, and that if they would do that, that work could be done in a way which would enable it to be done more cheaply than by carrying material out and dumping it in the usual place in deep water. The cost, so far, has been less for carrying material out to deep water. I believe, as in the case where we are dredging another portion of the harbor, it will later be found that a portion of the material can be dumped ashore at less cost than it can be carried out to sea.

Last year there was only one active harbor project in Baltimore. The amount expended for maintenance was \$218,000, and this year this will cost \$300,000, but the cost of maintenance of the Baltimore Channel is slight as compared with other ports. Again, the statement of General Taylor is of interest. I quote from what he said before the subcommittee, at page 1509 of the hearings, as follows:

General TAYLOR. The surveys for the project are ordinarily charged against the allotment for that particular work, and the cost would not appear in this project as it stands here. After the work is authorized by Congress, such an item as that would appear as overhead.

It so happens that in the Baltimore district this is the only project which was at all active last year. There may have been some small expenditures other than that, but you will find that practically the entire cost of the administration of the Baltimore district for that year was charged up to this one project. As I say, that is the only one upon which any active work was progressing; so that it represents the cost of the administration of the Baltimore office plus the cost of the overhead connected directly with this work.

Mr. DICKINSON. Last year you expended for maintenance \$218,000, and this year you are asking for \$300,000.

General TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. Would not that indicate very expensive maintenance?

General TAYLOR. No, sir. Until last year there had been very little maintenance upon that project for, I think, seven years, so that all we are doing now is removing the accumulated shoaling. It is not an expensive project to maintain. The estimate is \$150,000 a year, and our experience indicates that it will be even less than that.

The amount of money the port of Baltimore gets annually out of the enormous river and harbor appropriation is not very great, but all we need to do is to convince the engineers of the War Department of our needs and we will get a bigger allowance.

I favor a deeper channel, and introduced a bill for that purpose. I hope the shipping interests of Baltimore, as well as the city government, will next session join me in a strong effort to show the War Department the great possibilities of our port and the need of greater Government assistance.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak of while we are discussing appropriations. This morning the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, called up the conference report on House bill 6349, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes. In the discussion of the report I asked Mr. MADDEN about the amount of the net additions made by the Senate to the \$729,950,950.25 contained in the bill as passed by the House:

Mr. HILL of Maryland. What is the net addition made by the Senate?

Mr. MADDEN. The House receded from \$4,462,650, and that is the amount that is added.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The Senate made a very appreciable recession, did it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. If it had not been for the air mail, we would have had most of the money off.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. There is one more question I would like to ask the gentleman. As I understand from the report, the Senate receded on amendment No. 10, on page 21?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am sorry on principle they made that recession.

The Senate added \$3,418,930 to the House bill, but the House refused to agree, and the Senate dropped half of its addition. The Senate also added a very important amendment to that part of the House bill which I will read, as follows:

For expenses to enforce the provisions of the national prohibition act and the act \* \* \* known as the narcotic drugs import and export act, including the employment of executive officers, agents, inspectors, chemists, assistant chemists, supervisors, clerks, and messengers in the field and in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia, to be appointed as authorized by law; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts, and for the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, laboratory supplies, books, and such other expenditures as may be necessary in the District of Columbia and the several field offices, and for rental of necessary quarters, \$10,629,770: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,250,000 of the foregoing sum shall be expended for enforcement of the provisions of the said acts of December 17, 1914, and May 26, 1922: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the total amount appropriated shall be available for advances to be made by special disbursing agents when authorized by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.

The important amendment the Senate added to the above as it passed the House was amendment No. 10, offered by Senator BROUSSARD, which followed immediately after what I have just read and which reads thus:

*Provided further*, That none of the money here appropriated shall be expended in the commission of acts which are in violation of the national prohibition act, nor for inducing others to violate the provisions of said national prohibition act.

I originally offered this amendment in the House and discussed it fully during general debate on the bill. The House rejected it, but the Senate put it in. It is a limitation in the interest of constitutional government and was intended to help bring back respect for our Federal laws. The Senate, however, in conference receded from this amendment, and so it goes out of the bill. As I said this morning to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I am sorry on principle they made that recession. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: Current expenses, \$57,500; subsistence, \$287,000; household, \$139,000; hospital, \$230,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$47,050; farm, \$13,790; in all, Northwestern Branch, \$774,840.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KVALE: Page 97, line 21, after the word "subsistence," strike out "\$287,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to ask where the Clerk finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is offered to page 97, line 21, the figures \$287,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Had the Clerk started to read the next paragraph?

Mr. KVALE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE] is recognized for five minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I will not take up very much of your time. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has spoken at length on this subject, and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The gentleman from Wisconsin had to go home on account of a death in the family and asked me to present this amendment for him, and I gladly do so. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the statement that Milwaukee County feeds its prisoners on 90 cents a day; the home feeds its men on 27 cents, its general hospital patients on 35 cents, and its tuber-

cular patients on 52 cents per day. We ask an appropriation of \$600,000 instead of the \$287,000 allowed by the committee for subsistence.

I submit, gentlemen, that while what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has said may be true, I still repeat that you can not feed tubercular patients and give them good, wholesome food on the amount that is allowed here. I think every Member of this House knows, and some of us know from bitter experience in our own homes, that the three things necessary to cure tubercular patients are rest, fresh air, and good, rich food, and the last named is not the least important of the three, and you also have to have it palatable in addition to being rich.

You can not give them eggs that smell and taste of cold storage and lime, and you can not give them milk from which the cream has been extracted and expect them to get well. If I voted for these small amounts I would feel that I had the blood of these disabled soldiers on my hands. When you can vote millions and millions for rivers and harbors and hundreds of millions for other things I think you can vote a few hundred thousand dollars to give disabled veterans, and especially the tubercular patients, rich, wholesome food to give them back their life and their health.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. I will.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think this would be more in keeping with the spirit of the American people than to deny these men the necessities of life and appropriate \$10,000,000 for the German people, who are not under the American flag at all?

Mr. KVALE. Well, I voted for the German relief, and I would vote for more; but I do not see why that need hinder us from voting for the right amount for the disabled veterans. I agree with the gentleman that certainly the disabled veterans should come before the people of any foreign nation.

Mr. RANKIN. It simply looks to me like we were taking the bread away from American disabled veterans and giving it to aliens.

Mr. KVALE. There is bread enough both for the disabled veterans and the aliens if we would take some of the money that is squandered and apply it where it would do the most good.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen of the committee, it is quite significant that two members of this subcommittee are interested personally in certain homes. They are willing to face this House and take great responsibilities in regard to the homes not in their own districts. I notice the cut for the California home is comparatively insignificant. They are not going to have trouble there. I notice the cut is only about \$1,800 on the item for subsistence for the Kansas home.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. I have the figures right in front of me and can quote them accurately.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will ask for additional time for the gentleman. I would like to make an observation right here. I hope the gentleman will be perfectly fair in regard to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know that the soldiers' home is not in his home district.

Mr. ANTHONY. The California home to-day has a greater membership than any of the other homes. They are jammed full, and increasing beyond their capacity to take care of them. It is absolutely necessary to provide every dollar that is appropriated here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not complaining about it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I thought the gentleman was.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And I am not criticizing this committee. I am merely calling the attention of the gentlemen of the committee and of this House to the fact that where the responsibility is greater and where they can see it under their own observation, they are not disposed to pare the items down as close as they do here; \$1,800 only is taken off the estimate of the Board of Managers for the Leavenworth (Kans.) branch, and \$29,000 is taken off the subsistence at the Central Branch of the Soldiers' Home at Dayton, Ohio. It is a deplorable condition at the time of this crisis of the soldiers' home that the political situation should be injected into it, because the Board of Managers and the control of the home is in the hands of General Wood, who happens to be a Democrat. The conditions are truly frightful at these homes, and, as I say, it is deplorable that \$29,000 should be deducted in one instance so as to subject him to more criticism and raise more confusion.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.



Mr. BARBOUR. So far as the Pacific Home is concerned I did not give it much consideration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not criticizing the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that he said that because I was on the committee this home was favored and more liberally treated. General Wood stated that he expected to leave for California, and he said that the home was filled up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It makes no difference, because you are getting sufficient appropriations with that in view. I want to say that Mr. HOLADAY is not here, for he was called back to Illinois. Mr. REECE was called back to Tennessee. Captain FREDERICKS wanted to be heard and he was called home to California. Mr. SCHAFER, whose brother has just died, was called back to Wisconsin, and he knows the frightful conditions in this home. It is deplorable that these gentlemen could not be here to speak in behalf of the veterans.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the pending amendment, it proposes to increase the amount for subsistence in the Northwestern Home from \$287,000 to \$600,000. One thing to be commended in the amendment is its extreme modesty. Of course, if the gentleman should get \$600,000 for that home he would not know what to do with it. It shows to what extremes men can go in their enthusiasm. It is not fair to the House to offer such a ridiculous amendment.

The situation is that this has recently been turned into a tuberculosis hospital. There are only a thousand men there; the population will increase, but it is not large at this time. The committee took into consideration the fact that it would be some time before it was running to its maximum capacity. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio that this committee desires to give these men all the money that is necessary to buy the best food that can be purchased, and we believe they are going to get it.

Mr. KVALE. I want to say that if I had been writing the amendment I would have made it for a smaller sum, but I have offered it for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], and I really think that it should be adopted.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? If they had moved the tubercular hospital down to Arizona or New Mexico, they could save these men. It is the most ridiculous thing in the world to have a hospital up there in this place.

Mr. ANTHONY. We now have a hospital at Prescott, Ariz., and New Mexico, the best places in the world for tuberculosis patients.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do you not send the soldiers there?

Mr. ANTHONY. Because you can not get the soldiers to go down there; there are not enough bright lights to amuse them.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, line 21, after the word "subsistence," strike out the figures "\$287,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000."

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the Northwestern Home for Veterans, located at Milwaukee, Wis., has 1,400 inmates, 600 of whom are in the hospital. These veterans, a few of them, are soldiers of the Civil War, others are from the Spanish-American War and World War veterans. They allow for inmates in the general hospital, for food, 37 cents a day. The tuberculous patients are allowed 52 cents a day. The general inmate that is not in the hospital is allowed 27 cents a day. I do not think it takes a lengthy argument in these times to prove that this is a grossly inadequate amount. Right in the same city of Milwaukee, in the county jail, the sheriff is allowed 90 cents a day for boarding each inmate. The house of correction, which is very much like a State prison, is allowed 65 cents a day for the board of each inmate. Almost every Congressman from Wisconsin has received letters and complaints from the inmates of the hospital, showing that they were feeding patients storage eggs and oleomargarine, and that they were not receiving the wholesome food that they ought to have. Right in the jails of Wisconsin we feed the inmates butter, and oleomargarine is barred; we give our prisoners a wholesome diet. We think it is wise if we want to reform a man to feed him decent food. And yet these honored veterans, who have fought the battles of their country, we feed storage eggs and oleomargarine, and I do not believe, for one, that we are doing our duty, in this respect, to the veterans.

My substitute would give less than \$100,000 more than the amount provided in the bill, and not one cent of it would be wasted. There are more people coming in asking for admission to the Veterans' Home in Milwaukee than they can ac-

commodate. The help in these hospitals are getting only about \$24 a month. It is, of course, difficult to obtain efficient help for this amount. This amendment simply goes to the question of the food that you are going to give to these veterans, whether you are going to feed them good butter, whether you are going to feed them fresh eggs and good milk, or whether you will feed these veterans who are trying to recover from tuberculosis on 52 cents a day and those patients in the general hospitals at 35 cents a day. That is the question to be decided by this amendment.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am wondering if this institution has in connection with it, as the one here in the District has, a dairy herd and a little truck farming, the raising of those things on which they feed these people?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do not think they do. This veterans' home is not in my district. It is situated in Milwaukee, a city of 500,000 inhabitants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, just for the information of the House, I want to give an idea of what the men in the tuberculosis hospitals have in the way of a daily bill of fare. We had one of these placed in the Record. Here is the menu for the tubercular men at the Central Branch Home for the week ending January 26, 1924: In the first place, they are served with sugar, sirup, bread, butter—not oleomargarine—seasoning sauces, coffee, and milk at all meals.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. But the one that we are now discussing is the Northwestern Home.

Mr. ANTHONY. My understanding is that butter is served at all of the homes. In addition to the things that I have already mentioned, let us take the meals for Sunday, January 20, 1924. For breakfast they had stewed prunes, oatmeal, Puffed Rice, corn flakes, fried eggs, and toast. For dinner they had barley soup, crackers, roast chicken with dressing, mashed potatoes, string beans, pickles. And for supper, hamburger with onions, hashed brown potatoes, fruit cake, and ice cream. Now, let us take the menu for Friday, January 25. For breakfast they had grapes, Cream of Wheat, Grape Nuts, Puffed Rice, broiled ham, eggs. For dinner they had cream of corn soup, roast beef, brown gravy, brown potatoes, peas, cottage pudding, lemon sauce. And for supper, creamed chipped beef, potato salad, pickled beets, preserved pineapple. We endeavor to provide sufficient raw materials necessary for this diversified menu. If it is not properly prepared and set before these people in edible manner that is not the fault of the Congress, but it is the fault of the officials who have charge of the institutions.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think we can furnish that menu in the city of Milwaukee at a cost of 52 cents a day?

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman labors under a misapprehension, I think, in giving these figures. He must understand that the 52 cents a day represents the bare cost of the raw materials. In addition to that there is probably 30 or 40 cents a day additional taken out of other appropriations to pay for the labor and other costs that enter into the preparation of this food. The cost of these meals is not merely 52 cents a day.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And everything is bought at wholesale.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I understand, but the regular amount for the hospitals is 35 cents a day. I am informed that for the tuberculosis hospitals it is 52 cents.

Mr. ANTHONY. Of course, it varies in the different hospitals.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It does not seem as if you could do that in Milwaukee, where the cost of living is as high as it is here.

Mr. ANTHONY. This may surprise the gentleman. Take the home out in California. That is the most popular of any of them. There is an enormous demand for beds and rooms there. More veterans want to get in there than they can accommodate. The per capita cost there is lower than at any other home in the country, and according to these figures that we have quoted here one would think that we were starving the men out there, but the answer is that food is much cheaper out there, and they are probably being better fed than at some of these other homes where costs are higher.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. In the per capita cost in California is not the question of heat taken into consideration?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, they have to heat the buildings out there. But they do not use nearly the amount of fuel that they would in the northern latitudes. The gentleman would be sur-

prised at the climate of Los Angeles. There are probably as many days there on which they need fuel as in Milwaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the boys write me that they are furnished with just such meals as the chairman has suggested once in a while, and they complain about the way the meals are usually served, their daily suppers and breakfasts; that they can not get proper food, nor in sufficient quantity. It is not cooked properly, seasoned, nor is it served in clean utensils. This is so because they can not get enough money from Congress to operate on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment by way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 33, noes 29.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers on that.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin and Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa were appointed to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 48, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eastern Branch, Togus, Me.: Current expenses, \$45,000; subsistence, \$90,000; household, \$100,000; hospital, \$50,000; transportation, \$500; repairs, \$27,000; farm, \$19,772; in all, Eastern Branch, \$332,272.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 2, after the word "subsistence," strike out the figures "\$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$94,784"; and in line 3, after the word "hospital," strike out the figures "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$59,500."

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Eastern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is located at Togus, Me., within the district which I represent and within a few miles of my home. The governor of this institution and many of his coworkers are personal friends of mine. I have often visited the institution and know something of its work and its needs. For the service being rendered there I have only words of commendation and praise. No such abuses exist here as have been described as obtaining in other national homes.

This institution at Togus, Me., is not a reformatory, to be conducted at the lowest possible cost. It is not a Federal poor-house, toward which the self-respecting veteran, disabled by age or disease, must turn reluctant feet. On the contrary, it represents an honest and more or less successful effort on the part of a just and generous Government to provide for its former defenders a real home when age, sickness, and ill fortune shall have overtaken them. So far as an institution can take the place of a home to the aged, the sick, and the infirm this institution is doing it. The care there is kindly. The quarters are comfortable. The food furnished at the home, while simple and restricted in variety, is sufficient in amount and of good quality. These standards, however, have been maintained in the past only by the exercise of the strictest economy.

This home cares for veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish War, and the World War. It has perhaps a greater percentage of Civil War veterans than any other home. There are here between two and three hundred of these men, of an average age of from 80 to 82 years. Time has robbed them of about everything that makes life worth living and left them there with their infirmities and memories of the past. A few short years and the post bugler will sound "taps" over the last survivor. With them are 280 veterans of the Spanish War and 87 World War veterans.

Last Fourth of July I had the privilege of addressing these veterans at the home. Many of them are personally known to me. I told them then how great were their respective services to the Government in its times of national need, and, as a most humble representative of that Government, I assured them of

a national gratitude that would endure as long as the American ideals for which they fought should animate the hearts of our people. It is because I would keep faith with these men that I offer this amendment to-day and ask you to support it.

The estimated needs of this home for the coming year were based on 60 years' experience with a real budget, with a view simply of maintaining the present decent standards. Those estimates of absolute need have been reduced in this bill over \$23,000, but it is to two items only that this amendment applies, those of "subsistence" and "hospital."

Last year's appropriation for subsistence at this home was \$95,000, of which more than \$94,500 will be necessarily expended. The location of this home, high freight rates, and its low membership combine to raise the cost of ration and other supplies; yet the results of the economies practiced here have been surprising. The average daily cost of the ration per man, in round numbers, for both general and hospital messes, from 1921 to date, is as follows:

	1921	1922	1923	1924
General mess.....	\$0.32	\$0.27	\$0.30	\$0.32
Hospital mess.....	.36	.33	.37	.38

The daily ration cost of one of the great lumber companies of my State is said to be \$1.20. You have heard it stated on this floor that the Veterans' Bureau hospitals pay 64 cents per day for general patients and 88 cents for tubercular patients. Yet this home, handicapped by location and small membership, is feeding the general mess for 32 cents and the hospital mess for 38 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will be glad to agree to that if the gentleman will agree that debate may close at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. It can close at any time the gentleman likes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close at the end of 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. The appropriation carried in this bill is \$90,000, \$4,600 less than the amount economically expended the present fiscal year to feed these veterans at 32 and 38 cents per day. I simply ask in this amendment that this deficiency be restored and the present standard maintained. With it we have no complaint, although we are using butterine at this home, and not butter as claimed by the gentleman from Kansas. Shall we say to the aged, sick, and crippled veterans of our great wars that this country of ours, rich beyond all others, in whose defense in days that are gone they offered their youths and their lives, is too poor longer to continue to pay for the food of its defenders, 32 cents for the well and 38 cents for the sick? I trust not.

Mr. WEFALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I will.

Mr. WEFALD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that these old soldiers are not getting butter to eat?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. They get butterine.

Mr. WEFALD. I would like to state to the gentleman that in my State we passed a law a few years ago making it obligatory to feed a prisoner butter, and I think they ought to have butter.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. All I ask of you is to continue giving them an appropriation that will allow the present ration cost; but this appropriation cuts the allowance down \$5,000. Now, as to the matter of hospitalization. The appropriation for the present fiscal year was \$55,000. Of this amount practically \$50,000—the entire amount of the present appropriation—was required for the pay of the various classes of employees, leaving the balance of \$5,000 to be used for drugs, surgical supplies, and instruments and appliances for a hospital now caring for 162 patients. In the month of February last, of the 262 Civil War inmates of this home 106 were in the hospital. Daily the advanced age of these men is materially increasing this number.

Already each trained nurse in the hospital is charged with the care of approximately 35 patients. The appropriation carried in this bill covers the labor item alone and leaves nothing for hospital supplies and equipment. I do not want you to



confuse the situation at this home with that at any other. This amendment simply provides that the present standard of subsistence shall continue in this home, and that a small sum over and above the actual pay of the employees shall be allowed for the proper conduct of the hospital. We are not asking for a large sum of money. The total increase asked for is less than \$15,000. This Congress has already appropriated many millions of dollars more or less wisely. We shall appropriate many millions more. We have provided for service men in the strength of their young manhood, and have not been unmindful of the needs of strangers across the sea. If the time has come to economize, let it not be in taking from those to whom we owe so much the little so necessary for their care and comfort.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Is there about the same number this year as there was last year?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. There are between six and eight hundred there. The total varies according to the number of inmates absent on leave. Prices, however, are a little higher than they were last year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is the gentleman offering an amendment providing that no money shall be spent up there for any purpose if they feed oleomargarine to the patients?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. No. But one of the first items on the menu for the week ended March 29 last was "butterine." We are not asking for more money than has been given us in the past, but simply that the former appropriations shall be continued, because we can not with less give these veterans proper service.

Mr. WEFALD. Has the gentleman offered an amendment to increase the amount?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I have.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the Eastern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is the smallest branch maintained by the Government. The appropriation for subsistence and the hospital was granted proportionately, so that it is just \$4,000 less for the next fiscal year than the actual cost this year.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Four thousand six hundred dollars.

Mr. ANTHONY. The reason for that is that the attendance at the Eastern Branch is constantly dwindling. It is running down at the rate of about 100 a year. Judged by the actual cost of maintaining it, it would appear that this branch ought to be wiped out of existence, because it is the costliest branch we have, and the managers have repeatedly recommended that it be discontinued.

There is a hospital up there with a capacity of 350, and yet with a capacity of 350 in that hospital and about 150 patients we are providing for 123 civilian attendants. The Veterans' Bureau makes an explicit statement in regard to the program for the next fiscal year. Captain Jones in the hearings said to us that in the current year the Veterans' Bureau had only 8 or 10 people at the Togus Branch. None are estimated for the year 1925. So what is the use in appropriating money that they probably will not use?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The time has been fixed. Two minutes remain.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Where do you get these figures from?

Mr. ANTHONY. From the Board of Managers.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I have letters received within the last two or three days that do not corroborate those figures at all, and they come from the officials of the home.

Mr. ANTHONY. The testimony is that the attendance there is getting less and less each year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is true that we probably could abandon the Togus Branch of the soldiers' home economically. But this is not a question of bright lights to amuse the members. It is because the families of the patients live in the vicinity. I would not want to see a proposition adopted that would grind the men down still further, where they could not live in the vicinity of their families and relatives. I believe they ought to be maintained, if they desire, near their own homes and amid the familiar surroundings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANTHONY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 31, noes 29.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. NELSON of Maine and Mr. ANTHONY to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 39, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Board of Managers: President, \$4,000; secretary, \$500; general treasurer, who shall not be a member of the Board of Managers, \$5,000; chief surgeon, \$4,500; assistant general treasurer, \$3,500; inspector general, \$3,500; assistant chief surgeon, \$3,500; clerical services for the offices of the president, general treasurer, chief surgeon, and inspector general, \$18,700; clerical services for managers, \$2,700; traveling expenses of the Board of Managers, their officers and employees, including officers of branch homes when detailed on inspection work, \$14,000; outside relief, \$100; legal services, medical examinations, stationery, telegrams, and other incidental expenses, \$1,700; in all, \$61,700.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAILE: Page 100, after line 5, insert: "The following persons shall be entitled to the benefits of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and may be admitted thereto upon the order of a member of the Board of Managers, namely, honorably discharged officers, soldiers, sailors, or marines who served in the Regular, Volunteer, or other forces of the United States, or in the Organized Militia or National Guard when in the Federal service, and who are disabled by diseases or wounds and by reason of such disability are either temporarily or permanently incapacitated from earning a living."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas reserves a point of order.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I think probably this amendment is subject to a point of order if any gentleman desires to raise it, but I hope it will not be raised. Its effect is simply to admit to the soldiers' homes members of the Regular Establishment, notwithstanding they may not have served in time of war.

As it stands at present, we only admit honorably discharged soldiers of the Regular or Volunteer forces who served in time of war, except at one institution, the National Soldiers' Home in Washington. There are, however, many old soldiers who have had two or three enlistments at a salary which does not permit a man to save much money. When they become old and decrepit they have no place to go or any place they can call their home. Ex-Regular soldiers are a self-reliant class of men. Generally they are not recipients of much in the way of public assistance, but some of them need such assistance through no fault of their own. There is only a small number of these men in the aggregate; and my amendment, of course, does not propose any specific addition to expense, although it is possible it would result in some small addition to expense.

But these old men, it seems to me, are deserving of our considerate treatment. We urge them to come into the Army; they are our reliance in time of need; we pay them a very small stipend for their services; we take the best years of their lives; and it seems to me only decent that when they are no longer able to serve us they should have the comfort and care which the national soldiers' homes afford.

I might say that this amendment is approved by the president of the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Home. I have a letter from General Wood to that effect, saying:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 11 and thoroughly agree with your sentiments on this subject. I have felt for some time that our eligibility clause did injustice to a large number of very deserving soldiers of the Regular Army who may have put in two or three enlistments; but as these enlistments took place during a period of peace we can not take care of them when they get old and decrepit and need our help.

That is all I have to say on the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Would not the gentleman's amendment very greatly increase the number of men who would be eligible for admission to the soldiers' homes?

Mr. VAILE. Well, I do not think it would result in a very great increase.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Has the gentleman any estimate?

Mr. VAILE. I confess I have no estimate, but during my experience in Congress I have had only two such cases brought to my attention.

Of course, most men come out of the Regular Army fitted to go into some other line of work, and many of them are at an age when they can be employed, and they have learned habits and acquired character which make them desirable to employers. But there are some cases where, through misfortune, a man is not able to take care of himself. Let me suggest further that my amendment really involves no change of policy. We admit ex-Regulars now to the national home here in Washington even though they may not have served in war. But it is impracticable for them all to come to Washington.

Now, we have a Regular Army of 125,000 men. If the amendments offered by some of my friends should carry and that number should be cut in half, the number of those who would be eligible for admission to these homes in the future would be still more greatly reduced.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be, would it not, to throw these soldiers' homes open to any man who served in any arm of the National Guard in Federal service in any war or in the Regular Army in time of peace?

Mr. VAILE. That is the effect of it. Of course, the Volunteer Army and the National Guard have active Federal service only in time of war, but we have a small residuum of men whom we urge to come into the Army, and we rely on them; we urge them to go in, and it seems to me the decent thing would be to take care of those men.

Mr. ANTHONY. At the present time the only home those men could get into would be the Regular Army Home at Washington?

Mr. VAILE. That is the only home.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors: For continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended, including all classes of soldiers admissible to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, \$700,000: *Provided*, That for any sum or sums collected in any manner from inmates of such State or Territorial homes to be used for the support of said homes a like amount shall be deducted from the aid herein provided for, but this proviso shall not apply to any State or Territorial home into which the wives or widows of soldiers are admitted and maintained.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Page 100, line 19, after the word "maintained," insert "oleomargarine or any other substitute for butter shall not be used in any national home for disabled soldiers in place of butter made from pure dairy cream."

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment on the ground that it is legislation and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin anything to say in answer to that point of order?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I think it is germane because in this appropriation bill we are providing for the food of the veterans in these national homes, and I think it is proper in the same act to say that they shall not use a substitute which I think is deleterious to health.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the Chair thinks it is clearly legislation and that that can be

the only purpose of it. Therefore the Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment; at the same place, same line, and same page the following language to be inserted:

That no appropriations under this act shall be expended by the Board of Managers of the National Military Homes in the purchase of any oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitutes for butter.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to do this, but under the rules amendments ought to be submitted in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is right. Has the gentleman his amendment in writing? The Clerk is unable to read from memory a long amendment like that, and it is not fair to ask him to do it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk may read the bill while the gentleman is preparing his amendment.

Mr. ROACH. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Chairman. We can not halt the business of the House while the gentleman prepares his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including salaries of district judge, \$7,500; district attorney, \$5,000; marshal, \$5,000; and gratuities and necessary clothing for indigent discharged prisoners, \$912,000.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It seems to me, Members of the House and Mr. Chairman, that it is well for us to call attention at this time to the fact that in this appropriation of \$326,000,000 probably one-third of it is for nonmilitary purposes.

The great cry throughout the country for reduction in the expenditures of Congress for the maintenance of a war machine ought to bring a response when we point out to the people of the country that one-third of this appropriation is really for the development of commerce, industry, and ways of peace.

Nearly \$56,000,000 of the total amount appropriated for the Corps of Engineers is for nonmilitary purposes—development of rivers and harbors, flood control along our great inland waterways, the maintenance of national homes and hospitals for the veterans of the Civil War. The upkeep, maintenance, and government for the Panama Canal and Zone calls for \$7,240,000. These, gentlemen, are, it is true, all a part of our national defense system, but more largely items of commerce and industry of a great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in that connection it seems to me it is well to call attention this afternoon to the fact that in this bill we carry an appropriation of practically \$14,000,000 for the further development of the aircraft arm of military defense. I wonder whether we realize where the threatened war scare is to come from?

I understand that Great Britain is appropriating about \$12,000,000 this year and greatly increasing her number of airplanes; that France is running a race with her, and Italy is saying she must do likewise, and if war looms before us it comes from that quarter.

A little over a year ago England had something like 384 airplanes under control of her air ministry. France at that time had 1,152. Unwilling to allow France to outstrip her, England increased her number of planes. Then France increased hers. The present plans of the English call for double the number of a year ago. France will, of course, attempt to excel her, and Italy declares she must likewise be compelled to spend millions to meet the expenditures of the other two. Where is the end of this mad rivalry? Is it not the old navy construction rivalry transferred to another sector of war possibility, while the people bow under the burden of taxation? I am for an adequate national defense, but earnestly protest against any part by our Nation in any such a program of rivalry.

Is it not time for another arms conference, this time to limit air armament? Is not a defense against war in the air the act of getting an agreement limiting air armament?

It seems to me it is time for us to ask the President to again call the nations of the earth together for a further conference along the line of providing against war by the limitation of destructive aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, there is appropriated for the operation, maintenance, and extension of waterworks, sewers, and pavements in the cities of Panama and Colon, during the fiscal year 1925, the necessary portions of such sums as shall be paid as water rentals or directly by the Government of Panama for such expenses.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Amend by inserting a new clause as follows, at the end of the bill: "The President is requested to enter into negotiations with such other nations as he may think proper for the purpose of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to the reduction and limitation of land armaments, including aircraft, and the decrease of the expense incident to their maintenance and expansion."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment expressed the view that was stated a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON]. The naval appropriation bill which passed the House the other day contains a provision similar to the one embodied in this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is identical with the purpose of the amendment attached to the naval bill, and that is to make a respectful request of the President that he shall go much further than the administration has already gone in the matter of trying to bring about an understanding or agreement among nations that may result in curtailing the burdens and dangers of militarism and making more certain international peace.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss this matter at any length, but I would like to have read by the Clerk an extract from an editorial which appeared only a week or so ago in the Saturday Evening Post. I am going to trespass upon the courtesy of that great journal to the extent perhaps of infringing its copyright so that this may be done. The extract bears upon the very point mentioned a few moments ago relative to the rapid construction of aircraft by the European powers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

During 1922 France built 3,300 battleplanes, which brought her air strength up to 140 service squadrons for 1923. Inasmuch as Great Britain had built only 200 planes during the year and could muster the comparatively insignificant total of 35 service squadrons, the Government became alarmed. It was felt that national security would be threatened if a one-power standard were not attained. As a first step toward that end it was decided on June 27 of last year to expand the Royal Air Force to a strength of 82 squadrons. France made a sharp and instantaneous countermove. Two days after John Bull announced his intention of seeking equality in the air the French Chamber of Deputies voted to add 68 squadrons to the French Air Force, which would bring the total up to 208, and leave the British as hopelessly outclassed as before.

In the meantime Italy is also feeling the urge to build aerial dreadnoughts. Mussolini recently stated: "If others arm in the air Italy must arm in the air."

The irony of the situation is that so far the competition is between allies. Must we regard the present race as a mere curtain raiser to the competitive fury that will rage when the enemy countries are in a position to enter the annihilation handicap? If brothers in arms can thus pyramid their expenditures and wreck their chance of economic revival in a spirit of, presumably, friendly rivalry, what would happen if Germany struggled to her feet and the Russian giant broke free from his soviet shackles?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume the gentleman from Virginia will not contend it is not legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am very sorry my friend has made the point of order, but, Mr. Chairman, I can not contest that the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise with the consent of the gentleman to express the wish that the gentleman will withdraw his point of order. Let us give expression to the sense of this branch of the Congress toward peace.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee will indulge the Chairman he would like to make a one-minute personal state-

ment. This has been a hotly contested bill. In my capacity as Chairman I have been called upon to make enough rulings during the consideration of this bill to probably displease almost every Member of the House in some particular or another. I shall be sorry, of course, if I have done this, but shall feel compensated in some measure if the membership of the House will believe that in making these rulings I have had but one object in view, and that is to establish and maintain the procedure of the House that it may best serve the public good. [Applause.]

Where I have found a line of precedents uniform and founded upon principle, I have been careful not to disturb them, but have followed them scrupulously. On the other hand, where I have found the precedents in hopeless conflict, I have endeavored to decide in the way that, in my judgment, seemed most nearly in accord with the best reasoning and calculated in the end to make for the best procedure in the House without regard to the merits of the subject matter involved. If my colleagues will entertain this opinion of me, I shall feel fully compensated for any momentary displeasure I may have caused by overruling or sustaining the various points of order raised by them. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as one member of the committee may I say that with all the Chairman's faults, we love him still. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7877) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], covering a million-dollar road in Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 5, with relation to auctioneers.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WATKINS: Page 5, line 15; at the end of line 15, on page 5, insert: "Provided further, That no auctioneer shall be paid more than \$100 per day out of any money appropriated by this act for services rendered."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 87, line 18, strike out "\$20,000" and insert the following: "and for the extension of a park through the acquisition, by purchase or otherwise, of a strip of land, contiguous to the park, 66 feet wide, to connect the Shiloh National Military Park and the Corinth (Miss.) National Cemetery; such land to be acquired along or near the present main road from the Shiloh National Military Park to the Corinth National Cemetery, located on the battle field of Corinth, the center of such strip to follow as nearly as practicable along the survey heretofore made by Park Engineer Thompson; and for the construction of a hard-surface road and necessary bridges along the center line of such strip from the park to the Corinth National Cemetery; and for the erection of historical markers along such strip to show the movements of troops and other matters of historical interest in

connection with the Civil War Battles of Shiloh and Corinth; in all, \$70,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended within the incorporated limits of the city of Corinth."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not understand that this is the amendment which the gentleman from Kansas demanded a separate vote on. He said an amendment involving a million dollars.

Mr. ANTHONY. This is the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no million dollars in this amendment, but if it is the amendment the gentleman wishes to vote on I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment just reported.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 140, nays 137, not voting 155, as follows:

## YEAS—140.

Abernethy	Eagan	Lowrey	Ruby
Allen	Fayrot	Lozier	Salmon
Algood	Fisher	Lyon	Sanders, Tex.
Almon	Fitzgerald	McDuffie	Sandlin
Arnold	Fulmer	McReynolds	Sears, Fla.
Aswell	Gardner, Ind.	McSwain	Shallenberger
Bankhead	Garner, Tex.	McSweeney	Sherwood
Barkley	Garrett, Tenn.	Major, Ill.	Sites
Bell	Garrett, Tex.	Major, Mo.	Smithwick
Black, N. Y.	Gasque	Mansfield	Speaks
Bowling	Greenwood	Martin	Steagall
Boyce	Hastings	Michener	Stengle
Briggs	Hayden	Miligan	Stevenson
Browning	Hill, Ala.	Montague	Swank
Buckley	Howard, Nebr.	Mooney	Taylor, W. Va.
Bulwinkle	Huddleston	Moore, Ga.	Thomas, Ky.
Busby	Hudspeth	Moore, Va.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes, S. C.	Humphreys	Morehead	Thompson
Byrns, Tenn.	Jacobstein	Morrill	Tillman
Cable	Jeffers	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Casey	Johnson, Ky.	Oldfield	Upshaw
Cleary	Johnson, Tex.	Oliver, Ala.	Vincent, Mich.
Collier	Jones	Park, Ga.	Vinson, Ga.
Collins	Kent	Parks, Ark.	Ward, N. C.
Connally, Tex.	Kerr	Pou	Watkins
Cook	Kincheloe	Quin	Weaver
Crisp	Kunz	Ragon	Wefald
Croll	Kvale	Raney	Williams, Tex.
Cummings	Lanham	Raker	Wilson, Ind.
Curry	Lankford	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Rayburn	Wilson, Miss.
Dickinson, Mo.	Lazaro	Reed, Ark.	Wingo
Doughton	Lea, Calif.	Richards	Wolff
Drewry	Little	Rogers, N. H.	Woodrum
Driver	Logan	Romjue	Wright

## NAYS—137.

Ackerman	Faust	McLeod	Smith
Aldrich	Fenn	MacGregor	Snyder
Anthony	Fleetwood	MacLafferty	Sprout, Kans.
Ayres	Foster	Madden	Stalker
Barbour	Frear	Magee, N. Y.	Stephens
Beck	Free	Manlove	Strong, Pa.
Beedy	Freeman	Mapes	Summers, Wash.
Black, Tex.	French	Merritt	Swing
Bland	Frothingham	Miller, Wash.	Taber
Blanton	Fulbright	Moore, Ill.	Temple
Boles	Fuller	Moore, Ohio	Tatcher
Box	Gibson	Moore, Ind.	Tilson
Brand, Ohio	Gifford	Morgan	Timberlake
Browne, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	Nelson, Me.	Tincher
Buchanan	Griffin	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Burdick	Hadley	Newton, Minn.	Tucker
Burtness	Hardy	Nolan	Underhill
Burton	Harrison	O'Connell, R. I.	Vallie
Butler	Hersey	Parker	Vestal
Campbell	Hickey	Patterson	Voigt
Chindblom	Hill, Md.	Perkins	Watson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hill, Wash.	Porter	White, Kans.
Colton	Hoch	Ramseyer	White, Me.
Connery	Hudson	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Mich.
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, Iowa	Roach	Williamson
Cooper, Wis.	Hull, Morton D.	Robinson, Iowa	Winter
Dallinger	James	Robson, Ky.	Wood
Darrow	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff
Davis, Minn.	Ketcham	Sanders, Ind.	Wurzbach
Dempsey	Lampert	Schall	Wyant
Dickinson, Iowa	Leavitt	Scott	Yates
Dowell	Lehibach	Sears, Nebr.	Young
Dyer	Longworth	Shreve	
Elliott	McKenzie	Slimmons	
Evans, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair	

## NOT VOTING—155.

Anderson	Britten	Clark, Fla.	Denison
Andrew	Browne, N. J.	Cole, Iowa	Dickstein
Bacharach	Brumm	Cole, Ohio	Dominick
Bacon	Canfield	Connolly, Pa.	Doye
Beers	Cannon	Corning	Drane
Begg	Carew	Cramton	Edmonds
Berger	Carter	Cresser	Evans, Mont.
Bixler	Celler	Crowther	Fairchild
Bloom	Christopherson	Cullen	Fairfield
Boylan	Clague	Davey	Fish
Brand, Ga.	Clancy	Deaf	Fredericks

Funk	Kless	Morris	Seger
Gallivan	Kindred	Mudd	Sinnott
Garber	King	Murphy	Snell
Geran	Knutson	Newton, Mo.	Sprout, Ill.
Gilbert	Kopp	O'Brien	Stedman
Glatfelter	Kurtz	O'Connell, N. Y.	Strong, Kans.
Goldsborough	LaGuardia	O'Connor, La.	Sullivan
Graham, Ill.	Langley	O'Connor, N. Y.	Summers, Tex.
Graham, Pa.	Larson, Minn.	Oliver, N. Y.	Sweet
Green, Iowa	Leatherwood	Palge	Swoope
Griest	Lee, Ga.	Peavey	Tague
Hammer	Lilly	Peery	Taylor, Colo.
Haugen	Lindsay	Periman	Taylor, Tenn.
Hawes	Lineberger	Phillips	Tinkham
Hawley	Linthicum	Prall	Tydings
Holaday	Luce	Purnell	Vare
Hooker	McClintic	Quayle	Vinson, Ky.
Howard, Okla.	McFadden	Ransley	Wainwright
Hull, William E.	McKeown	Rathbone	Ward, N. Y.
Hull, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Reece	Wason
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNulty	Reed, W. Va.	Watres
Johnson, Wash.	Magee, Pa.	Reld, Ill.	Weller
Johnson, W. Va.	Mead	Rosenbloom	Welsh
Jost	Michaelson	Rouse	Wertz
Kahn	Miller, Ill.	Sabath	Williams, Ill.
Keller	Mills	Sanders, N. Y.	Winslow
Kelly	Minahan	Schafer	Zihman
Kendall	Morin	Schneider	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following pair was announced:

Mr. Dominick (for) with Mr. Griest (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Denison with Mr. Hawes.  
 Mr. Sweet with Mr. Brand of Georgia.  
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Lilly.  
 Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Jost.  
 Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Kindred.  
 Mr. Rathbone with Mr. McClintic.  
 Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tydings.  
 Mr. McFadden with Mr. Stedman.  
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Doyle.  
 Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peery.  
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Lee of Georgia.  
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Weller.  
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Davey.  
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Clark of Florida.  
 Mr. Kless with Mr. Hammer.  
 Mr. Reld of Illinois with Mr. Vinson of Kentucky.  
 Mr. Snell with Mr. Carew.  
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Tague.  
 Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Gallivan.  
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. McNulty.  
 Mr. Fairchild with Mr. Carter.  
 Mr. Begg with Mr. Summers of Texas.  
 Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Lindsay.  
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Deal.  
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Dickstein.  
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Canfield.  
 Mr. Paige with Mr. Sullivan.  
 Mr. Purnell with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. McKeown.  
 Mr. Seger with Mr. Minahan.  
 Mr. Winslow with Mr. Cresser.  
 Mr. Vare with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.  
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Cullen.  
 Mr. Luce with Mr. Quayle.  
 Mr. Wertz with Mr. Mead.  
 Mr. Kahn with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Bacon with Mr. Corning.  
 Mr. Cramton with Mr. Drane.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. O'Connell of New York.  
 Mr. Brumm with Mr. O'Brien.  
 Mr. Beers with Mr. Clancy.  
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Sabath.  
 Mr. Bixler with Mr. Geran.  
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Evans of Montana.  
 Mr. Fairfield with Mr. Morris.  
 Mr. Green of Iowa with Mr. Bloom.  
 Mr. Hawley with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Gilbert.  
 Mr. Keller with Mr. Oliver of New York.  
 Mr. King with Mr. Goldsborough.  
 Mr. McLaughlin of Nebraska with Mr. Boylan.  
 Mr. Mudd with Mr. Celler.  
 Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Prall.  
 Mr. Sinnott with Mr. Glatfelter.  
 Mr. Sprout of Illinois with Mr. O'Connor of New York.  
 Mr. Welsh with Mr. Linthicum.  
 Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Hooker.  
 Mr. Watres with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Wason with Mr. Cannon.  
 Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Berger.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during the roll call, but if I had been present and listening I would have voted "no."

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I was here a part of the time, but did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated many times that the theory on which gentlemen are allowed to vote is that their name was not called by mistake of the Clerk. If the gentleman will state that he was present and listening and did not hear his name called he can vote.



Mr. COLE of Iowa. I can not state, Mr. Speaker, that I was present when my name was called, but I would like to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I came in while the roll was being called, but after my name was called. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the Clerk call my name, and perhaps I was not listening. If permitted to vote, I would have voted "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers the motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

"Page 9, line 14, strike out the figures '\$51,887,415' and insert in lieu thereof the figures '\$41,887,415'; and in line 16, page 9, strike out the language 'and twenty-five,' so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"Pay of enlisted men: For pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, \$41,887,415: *Provided*, That the total authorized number of enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts, shall be 100,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK of Texas) there were—ayes 33, noes 189.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-two Members, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LONGWORTH) there were—ayes 216, noes 6.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ANTHONY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8233) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8233, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I neglected to get an agreement in respect to the division of the time. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8233 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8233, and pending that I suggest to the gentleman from Louisiana, who has charge of the bill on the other side, that the time for general debate be divided equally between the two sides, the

gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN] to control one half and I to control the other half, and that as far as any limitation on the time for debate is concerned, that it be not made until we meet again on Tuesday morning.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would it not be possible to arrange that general debate shall close to-day?

Mr. SANDLIN. Oh, I do not think it would be possible to make that agreement.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8233.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8233, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Brazil has 3,276,358 square miles and 30,636,000 people. The United States of America has 3,026,789 square miles and 110,000,000 people. They raise one great crop—coffee. We raise two great crops—wheat and cotton. Cotton is perfectly able to take care of itself and needs no help.

At the beginning of this Government we adopted the principle of a protective tariff to protect our American laborers and manufacturers in the home market, and it has been a wonderful success. Brazil about 20 years ago adopted the policy of protecting its coffee farmers in the foreign markets, and that has been a great success. America must now adopt a similar policy, and proceed to protect the American wheat farmer in the European market and do for the wheat farmer what it has done for the New England, New York, and Pennsylvania manufacturers and laborers. About 25 per cent of our wheat must be sold abroad. Unless our Government protects that wheat where it is sold the American farmer must discontinue 25 per cent of its production. When our shoemakers could not meet the foreign competition our Government gave them the necessary protection; and unless we do this now for the wheat farmer he will be ruined, because it is not going to be practical to decrease the production so much. Every fair man now simply looks for the method by which it can be accomplished safely.

The Brazilians sell their coffee in sacks of 132 pounds. At the end of the last century it was selling for about \$15 a sack in Europe. At the beginning of this century they crowded the world market with coffee and it fell to \$10 a sack. They undertook a system of valorization, by which the Government bought, stored, and exported Brazilian coffee and controlled the world market, which gradually developed into a system by which the farmer stored his coffee in the Government warehouses and received certain advances from the Government in cash. However, since June, 1923, the Government has practically neither bought nor advanced any cash to the growers on their coffee. The coffee is stored in the Government warehouses. The coffee growers borrow money from local banks and commissarios, on their coffee, either in the Government warehouses or in the fields, and the money is repaid at the seacoast when the Government permits the sale to the exporters. Brazil raises about the same size coffee crop as it did in 1899. The result is that March 1 coffee sold in London for \$22.70 a sack and in New York for \$20.40 a sack. At this end of March No. 4 Santos grade of coffee is selling in New York City for \$25 a sack. When they began to plan this work it was worth \$10 a sack, and the result is that they have now doubled its value. Coffee has been selling this year in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, at \$14.52 a sack and our consul at Santos says that Brazilian coffee is bringing exceptionally high prices.

#### HISTORY OF BRAZILIAN COFFEE PLAN.

As early as 1855 they were planting coffee in Brazil. By 1870 the Federal Government was buying sacks of coffee and sending them to Europe to discharge its obligations instead of buying exchange. In 1885 a tremendous impetus was given coffee planting. There are in Brazil three great coffee States, Sao Paulo, Minas Geraes, and Rio de Janeiro, which bear a much more important relation to the trade than even our

Northwestern States do to the wheat trade of this country. At the beginning of this century, when a crop of 15,000,000 sacks was produced in Brazil and the world market was flooded and coffee fell to \$10 a sack, great distress fell upon those particular States and practically all that has been done in that direction has been done by those States, particularly Sao Paulo, with the aid and comfort of the Federal Government. By 1906 the world had in storage 11,000,000 sacks of coffee, about three-fourths of a world crop. The crop of 1906-7 rose to the tremendous amount of 23,000,000 sacks, which on top of the 11,000,000 in storage precipitated what was equivalent to a catastrophe.

#### VALORIZATION.

By agreement at Taubate these three States undertook the beginning of this scheme of valorization. They planned to buy, store, and export coffee, and presently to advance money on the coffee when stored, and to levy an export tax of from 3 francs per sack to 5 francs presently, which enabled the Government to effectually determine what price should be paid in Brazil for coffee. At an early date they attempted the restriction of planting coffee trees to some extent and discussed and attempted many plans and theories which confused the American acquaintance with the subject. By 1910 this plan had succeeded in giving them practical control of the world market for coffee and that year they achieved a maximum price which brought prosperity to the Brazilian coffee planters.

The European war precipitated many difficulties which were gradually overcome. In fact, practically every year they were compelled to reorganize in order to secure sufficient funds and continue, but progress was gradually made. In 1917 the Government of Brazil loaned money to Sao Paulo to buy coffee, which plan by 1920 had proven successful. In 1919 the record shows that "the venture had proved very successful," and on June 19, 1922, a Federal Government decree was issued establishing a bureau or department for the "permanent protection of coffee." The success, of course, varied from year to year. The Department of Commerce informs me that in 1921 the average price for coffee at Rio de Janeiro was \$8.24 a sack, in 1922 was \$11.87, and in 1923 was \$14.53, and has been \$14.52 a sack this season. Since 1921 the Government does not appear to have been in the market for coffee but has permitted it to be stored and advanced money on it.

In 1923 much of the coffee was gathered in the midst of torrential rains, which ruined much of the crop, and the Government and the people met considerable difficulty in offsetting those conditions. The Brazilian capital stepped in and loaned money to the coffee planters on their crops and their storage and made unnecessary foreign aid for handling this crop, and as the consul at Santos says, this year they are receiving exceptionally high prices. On March 1 coffee was selling at \$14.52 at Rio de Janeiro, at \$20.40 in New York, and at \$22.70 in London.

#### WHAT THEY DO.

The Federal Government of Brazil has erected 10 great coffee warehouses of superb equipment at Rio Preto, Rincão, Araraquara, São Carlos, Itirapina, Casa Branca, Campinas, Campo Limpo, and two at São Paulo. They have a storage capacity of 4½ million sacks, and handle 10 million sacks in the course of the year. In Rio Province, at Puerto, they are building a warehouse to contain 1,000,000 bags, and warehouses are to be added at Campinas which will contain 4,000,000 bags. Thus, a total capacity for holding nearly 10,000,000 sacks of coffee exists in Brazil. The Government has an arrangement with the railroads which transport that coffee from the fields to these warehouses and manage its storage there and its later shipment to the seaports of Santos and Rio de Janeiro. Every working day the Government permits the transport of 35,000 sacks to the port of Santos and 12,000 sacks to the port of Rio de Janeiro for export. The export is confined to the coffee so sent to the seacoast, and those warehouses have the capacity to thus handle and dispose of during the year about 20,000,000 sacks of coffee. When this coffee reaches Santos and Rio the exporters purchase it, though sometimes the Government still exports apparently. In other words, the coffee growers receive an advance when they deposit their coffee in the warehouses but only part ownership with their crop at Rio or Santos to the exporter, thus receiving what is paid at the seacoast, less the freight and handling charges up to that point.

The Department of Commerce has just informed me that the States place an export tax of 9 per cent ad valorem on the coffee exported from Santos and 8½ per cent ad valorem on the coffee exported from Rio, which taxes go to sustain the valorization plan.

Since I wrote the foregoing E. H. O'Brien, of San Francisco, has sent me the results of his recent visit to the Brazilian coffee markets which he made during the last six months. Twenty million sacks is a good world's crop, and three-fourths of that comes from Brazil. Twenty-five years ago Brazil's crop was about 15,000,000 sacks, as now. Mr. O'Brien says that owing considerably to the improvement in Brazilian finances, paper money, and exchange the export value of Brazil's one crop is about 300,000,000 gold dollars, which would be about \$20 a sack. This is a decided improvement upon the figures heretofore presented, and is in accord with reports from our Santos consul that prices are exceptionally high, and completely rounds out and fortifies my original declaration that Brazil's coffee plans have been a wonderful success. Indeed, Mr. O'Brien concludes as follows:

In our opinion, Brazil undoubtedly will be the theater of enormous commercial development within the next decade. They are proceeding and progressing most orderly, sanely, and still most rapidly. With regard to its coffee-crop movements their problems seem past ones. The almost astounding success of this last defense movement, accomplished without the assistance of outside management or capital, and with the modern and permanent interior warehouse system affording such complete control, every indication would point that any future problem is already anticipated and guaranteed by a perfected Gibraltar defense fort.

Mr. O'Brien, by the way, calls attention to the fact, entirely overlooked apparently by our officials, that Brazilian capital is caring for the Brazilian crop without foreign aid and without Government financial help. I shall ask leave to insert in the Record Mr. O'Brien's review of Brazilian conditions, and commend it to the Members of the House who are interested in Brazilian efforts to help the farmer. It is the best paper on that subject I have ever seen anywhere. The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal seems to recognize him as a good man and a good authority, and I hope you will read his statements. In what way can we utilize Brazilian experience to help our wheat farmers? In my judgment full information with regard to the Brazilian coffee plan is the greatest aid we can possibly have.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Can the gentleman tell us approximately how much of the world supply of coffee is raised in Brazil?

Mr. LITTLE. Three-fourths of it. Colombia is probably the principal rival. The Brazilian crop of 15,000,000 sacks per annum is just about what it was at the close of the last century. What legislation has done to it has enabled it to greatly increase its prices but has not resulted in any serious extension of its area. Encouragement of the coffee trade by law has not resulted in tremendous acreages, and there is no reason why careful handling should greatly increase the wheat fields.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I hesitate to make a suggestion to the gentleman, because he is well posted on this subject; but there is a great distinction between coffee and wheat.

Mr. LITTLE. I can not yield for a speech on that subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Not everyone uses coffee, but everyone uses wheat.

Mr. LITTLE. I have traveled in four continents and the islands of the sea and found people drinking coffee everywhere pretty much, but I have seen millions who scarcely ever eat wheat. The same principles apply to the handling of both crops, and they are entirely alike in their powers of preservation and storage.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman to state that the Government of Brazil advances money to the coffee growers for coffee to be used for domestic purposes?

Mr. LITTLE. Coffee used in Brazil is, I understand, supplied by the commission houses at Santos and Rio, by the men who also export. There is so little information in Washington on the subject that I have had very great difficulty in presenting the facts that I have here, and I do not believe you will find anything available here with as many facts assembled on the subject as there are in this article. I have raked and scraped everything that I could find. Brazil's home consumption of coffee is comparatively very small. In the United States we will consume three-fourths of our wheat crop, and the Government will not be compelled to buy the home consumption wheat. They will only attempt to handle the exportable wheat.

The Government of the United States can utilize for storage all the great warehouses that we now possess and need build nothing. The Government ships of the United States are all ready to transport our wheat all over the world at a minimum of expense.



## OUR LOCAL PRICES.

In order to assist the American farmer we must meet him at the harvest field with a price which will at least equal his cost of production. Unless this Government prepares to do that much the farmer must discontinue planting so much wheat. Unless you do that you can not protect him in any foreign market. I have estimated that the Government must prepare to pay him at least \$1.10 a bushel at his home town, and if such a bill should be enacted Congress could easily determine another price if it saw fit. If you can actually get him more without precipitating a cataclysm of wheat acreage next fall, let us do it. If the American farmer knows the Government is prepared to pay him \$1.10 at home, he will sell for no less, and if the American wheat buyer and miller realizes the Government is prepared to do that, they will pay \$1.10 at the farmer's home town, and that will be the price of wheat all over this country, as made by Government competition which they must meet. Thus you see that the Government need buy no wheat that is intended for home consumption. That wheat will take care of itself without any Government interference at all. You have thus disposed of some 600,000,000 bushels or three-fourths of our crop. The Government must then be prepared to purchase all our exportable wheat at \$1.10 or whatever price may be decided on. That wheat the Government must arrange to ship abroad into the foreign market.

Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture does that he will be able to dominate the price of wheat at Liverpool. He will be able to give the American farmer assurance that he will never again lose money on his wheat crop. This year the world's wheat crop is 500,000,000 bushels less than was its average for the six years before we went into the war, and there is always a market for all the world raises, and always will be.

The storage plan will apply to every article that is grown on the farm that is sound, preservable, and easily transportable. Some gentlemen suggest, what was the difference between coffee and wheat. A grain of wheat and a grain of coffee endure as well one as the other. We proceed in this bill on the theory that when we find wheat and the Government will pay \$1.10, you will not take any less. When the buyer finds the Government will buy, the Government will not have to buy any. The farmer will get the price, and that will mean \$1.10.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says and agree with him on most things, but what I want to ask the gentleman is this: I have heard the gentleman's argument that the Secretary of Agriculture might be able to control the price at Liverpool with this sort of a bill. I was wondering why the present grain exchanges that buy wheat and control the farmers' wheat now when they get it, why they are not in a position to control this?

Mr. LITTLE. Why do not they control it in Brazil for coffee? The same reason. You can not make a bunch of speculators assist the American farmer, and this must be taken care of by the Government, and you can not create a corporation to do it. That was illustrated in the Ship Building Corporation, and by the old Grain Corporation which beat the American farmers out of about 800 million dollars in one year.

Mr. BURTNESS. What is the gentleman's comment on this situation? The world has got to have absolutely the Brazilian coffee crop—

Mr. LITTLE. And the American wheat.

Mr. BURTNESS. Well, American wheat for export is only about 200,000,000 bushels—

Mr. LITTLE. And they need every bushel of it.

Mr. BURTNESS. On the whole, that is a small percentage of what is used by the world now—

Mr. LITTLE. They need every bit of wheat they can get. In the six years since the war we have shipped 1,500,000,000 bushels of wheat to Europe. By all plans but this from Brazil you will lose money on every bushel you ship to Europe, according to all claims advanced. The only possibility to beat the game is for some great disinterested party like this Government or that of Brazil to store and hold the wheat till they come to a suitable market price. If we had received 20 cents a bushel more in Europe we would be \$300,000,000 better off. In my judgment under my plan this Government could have done that. You know it could not be done any other way, so why quibble? I am going to discuss the proposition right now.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am glad the gentleman is.

Mr. LITTLE. If you examine House bill 8330, the bill I introduced regarding the wheat farmer, you will find that the principle stated might well include cotton, and if ever cotton should be involved in the difficulties that attack coffee and wheat the system could at once apply equally well. The attempt has been made to extend the principle of this system

of purchase to all farm products, including stock and stock products and grain products. If you will consider it a moment you will see that the same principle of purchase and storage will not apply to all these other things. The grain elevators dispense with any investment of that kind, while the care of stock and stock products and flour would require enormous investments, and such a proposition would mount up to a necessity for billions of capital continually invested. The complexities and complications of such a system would require a very advanced stage of socialistic government and many extravaganzas besides it seems to me. If we can dispose of the difficulties of the wheat farmer in one piece of legislation we will have accomplished for our people what Brazil has done for its people, and then we can take up one by one, not only all farm products but all other interests and difficulties which the Government can legislate to assist, but, gentlemen of the House, if we can not put through a bill to assist the wheat farmer, who is chin deep in all these difficulties, we can never hope on this floor ever to legislate for other people with the same friendship and good sense that we have extended to the beneficiaries of the protective tariff of this country.

We can then grasp the entire world market in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. The Liverpool market would cease to dominate anybody or any place or any price.

The development of the industries of this country under the protective tariff has given our workingmen the highest wages on earth and has established great factories and great cities all over the Nation. This was done by simply protecting their interests in our home market. Brazil has demonstrated beyond question that the interests of their coffee planters can be protected by their Government in foreign markets. We have here in our wheat farmers people who have developed so extensively that we produce a third more wheat than we consume. They contest with the world's market just as the manufacturers in New England contest with the world's product of manufactured goods in this country. They are entitled to the same protection, and have reached that extremity where they must either have that protection or discontinue and devote themselves to something else. A million people during the last 12 months removed from the farms to the towns and cities. Their march to town was as wonderful as the march of the Israelites from Egypt to the valley of the Jordan. Gentlemen of the House, do you want a thunderbolt to strike the Capitol before you can take notice of what is going on in this country? This is almost equivalent to a revolution in this country already, and you will soon have a business revolution if you do not do your duty by the wheat farmers just as you did your duty by the manufacturers. Brazil has blazed the way. Now, gentlemen, gird on your armor and get down to business.

Under House bill 8330 the Government would be authorized to pay \$1.10 a bushel for wheat at the farmer's home town and to pay up to \$1.25 a bushel with the market as it rose to that point. The Brazilian coffee plan has demonstrated that when the States or the Government of Brazil apply an export tax, and restrict the amount of export as this Government could, they at once have a tremendous influence on the world's purchasing price of the Brazilian product. When the Government is prepared to pay \$1.10 at Jonesburg, the men with the great mills would meet the Government competition and pay the same price, so that the Government would never be forced to buy any wheat at all for home consumption. These men have millions of dollars invested in the great mills. They can not afford to remain idle for a day. They will simply meet Government competition at every place and utilize the wheat in their mills for home consumption, so that there will be no difficulty with regard to the home price for wheat in this country. The proposition is so simple that it is sometimes difficult for men to believe that it could be done; but if you will calmly trust to your reason, and avoid your prejudice, and remember the history of Brazil, you will see that its certainty is really based on its simplicity. There are no foolish and pedantic complications involving the department in a maze of contradictions and impossibilities and fairy dreams. The millers and home utilizers will pay what the Government offers for wheat, because they must have that much for home consumption. If they should not, the Government will simply purchase that wheat, put it in the elevators temporarily, and sell it at home, if the home buyers made it necessary, and abroad in the final analysis. In short, the Government would apply to the handling of wheat the same brains and the same courage manifested by Joseph Leiter, backed by the immense resources of this great Republic, which would mean the mastery of the world trade in grain and cotton.

I have sometimes stood in awe at what improvements might occur in the world if every person in it would live under the exact application of the rules of good, ordinary, common sense

for 30 days. Let us try it, gentlemen, on the wheat trade. If it works, perhaps it might be applied to some other products of the farm; but I earnestly hope that if I shall have convinced anybody of the utility of my suggestions as to wheat, he will not spring at one bound to the conclusion that all the ills of humanity can be cured and all the difficulties meeting all farmers can be disposed of at one sweep of the pen because this proposition is reasonable and easy of accomplishment. If you undertake, gentlemen, to make the simple plan I have suggested here, or the equally simple plan of Brazil, apply to all this stock and all the crops and all the business of 110,000,000 of people, you will not be making a law, you will be writing a comic opera.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman referred to Brazil and the manner in which they handle the coffee production. Do not they restrict in Brazil the production of coffee to somewhere near the normal demand?

Mr. LITTLE. Early in its history Sao Paulo restricted the planting of coffee trees temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Can I get five additional minutes?

Mr. WOOD. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Early in the history of this plan they did, but I have explained about what they did. The people bring in the coffee to the Government warehouses in the interior, and they allow 35,000 sacks every workday to go to Santos for shipment and 12,000 to Rio, and that is all the restriction there is in it.

Mr. MORGAN. That is to prevent a decline from an overflow of the market?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; and the wheat is sold to the exporters at the seaports; they do not have a law to prevent the growing of it. Now, the simple fact is that they raise in Brazil now only 15,000,000 sacks of coffee, which is what they raised 24 years ago. It has not increased the crop at all.

Mr. MORGAN. That is what I had in mind. They restrict production?

Mr. LITTLE. No; they restrict shipment to the seaports for export.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, in the case of wheat, what is going to be the situation of the surplus production of wheat all around 180,000,000 bushels annually?

Mr. LITTLE. If there is any more than we consume, they will export it. The Government will pay \$1.10 for it in your home town and export it. Every year in the world they use every bushel they raise. This year we are 500,000,000 bushels behind the average world's production. It is just a question of what cash we are going to get out of it. My figure is that when the American Secretary gets to Europe, with 25 per cent of the wheat sold there and maybe more, he will dictate the price of wheat in Liverpool as Joe Leiter did in Chicago and as Brazil does. Suppose he withholds one-fourth of the crop in a year and ships no wheat to Europe? Wheat would then go up to a great price. Suppose he withheld all American wheat for three months from Europe? Everybody here realizes that wheat would go up. Suppose he made a combination with Canada and said, "You come with the Secretary of Agriculture, with all American wheat, and we will pool our interests and fix the price in Europe and run Argentina or anybody else off the field whenever we want to?" The Secretary of Agriculture is just as good a gambler as Joe Leiter. He can dominate the corner. That is a matter that appeals to a man's common sense and good judgment. Joe Leiter is the only man who ever did make any money for the farmer.

As to handling the 180,000,000 bushels exported annually, that is what this bill is for. The Government will buy that exportable wheat and sell it abroad, just as Brazil disposes of its coffee crop. They simply withhold it from the world market until a propitious moment arrives, and never rush their crop upon a crowded market, which ruined Brazil 25 years ago as it would now if permitted. Mr. Leiter handled the Chicago market and the Secretary, in my judgment, will be able to handle the market at Liverpool. He certainly ought to be able to combine with the other exporters and land there on amicable terms. We are losing money now, and, if necessary, he can ship a few millions into Europe and lose some more money and convince them that it is worth their while to deal with him. I do not see any reason why the Secretary of Agriculture can not control the prices from Washington easier than the gamblers do from Liverpool. He certainly can not do worse than we are doing nor than would any proposition by which you concede in advance you would lose money on every bushel shipped. At least, gen-

tlemen, let the farmer have a gambler's chance to win, which is denied him by all your other bills.

Once I heard Lord Rosebery speaking on Irish home rule in the English Parliament. He told how desperate was the situation and said he was ready to take a leap in the dark. The situation demands some new remedy for wheat. We may perhaps be compelled to take a leap in the dark; but, gentlemen, I would rather the Secretary of Agriculture would take the farmer by the hand and take him to Europe in the care of this Government, just as we protected the manufacturers at home from foreign foes. We can then protect his wheat crop at Liverpool and see that he gets the better of the market.

The difference between undertaking wheat and undertaking hogs and cattle and everything else is that with ordinary plain common sense wheat can be handled. But suppose on the same day the Government says, "I will buy all the hogs and steers and everything you produce." Over here at Jonesboro you would wire in and say, "How much money has the Government got to go into this thing?" You will buy the wheat when the Government shows you it has enough money on hand to buy it. But when the Government says, "I will buy everything," every buyer will find out why he should pay more than he did yesterday. You can not assemble enough money together, gentlemen, to handle more than one of these crops at a time. If you have a reserve of a few millions, you can handle all the wheat necessary to convince the wheat buyers you will go through; but, gentlemen, can not you realize how great a fund would be necessary to convince the hog and cattle people and the packers that you could handle all those products? Why, that would take billions, and you would be forced to have the money in the bank all the time. This proposition is reasonable and easy of accomplishment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in accord with the permission given me to extend my remarks, I present here the following statement from E. H. O'Brien, of C. E. Bickford & Co., of San Francisco, coffee brokers. He makes the best statement of conditions in Brazil in coffee planting and selling that I have seen anywhere and it was just written March 20, and is down to date better than anything I have seen in the Department of Commerce or in the American newspapers:

MARCH 20, 1924.

The writer has just returned from a second trip to Brazil made within the past six months.

In a report published December 20, 1923, we made every effort to portray what then appeared to be the inevitable happenings of the past three months, and it is with keen regret that we fear far too few of our buying friends accepted the facts in patterning their then future policies.

In our judgment, the immediate future is of infinitely more vital concern to United States buying interests than the statistical position which confronted them three months ago.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Luiz Suplicy, the recognized dean of Santos coffee brokers, who for more than 25 years past has enjoyed by far the largest volume of spot sales between commissario and exporting interests, and who is generally regarded as being the official Government representative in the distribution of their spot acquisitions, we were favored with the following highly interesting statistics:

Santos crop, 1923-24 (estimated).....	15,000,000	
Stock in Santos July 1, 1923.....	1,200,000	
Rio crop, 1923-24 (estimated).....	3,200,000	
Stock in Rio July 1, 1923.....	600,000	
Espirito Santo and north of Brazil.....	800,000	
		20,800,000
Exported from Santos July 1, 1923, to December 31, 1923.....	5,600,000	
Exported from Rio same period.....	2,600,000	
Espirito Santo and north of Brazil (which is all their present crop).....	800,000	
		9,000,000
Amount of coffee which will probably be exported from January 1, 1924, to June 30, 1924:		
Santos.....	5,100,000	
Rio (remainder of present crop).....	1,200,000	
		15,300,000
Balance for the 1923-24 crop.....		5,500,000
Estimated Santos crop, 1924-25.....	7,000,000	
Estimated Espirito Santo, Rio, and north of Brazil.....	3,000,000	
Balance brought forward from 1923-24 crop.....	5,500,000	
		15,500,000



If the world's consumption in 1924-25 is the same as this year we will probably start the 1925-26 crop without any stock in Brazil.

#### BRAZIL'S ABSOLUTE COFFEE CONTROL.

On our previous trip the only possible weak link in the absolute control of Brazil's domination and price dictate in supply was their possible pinch of money through steadily declining milreis values. On December 1, 1923, the milreis rate was 11½ to the dollar, against a par value of about 3 milreis to the dollar. To-day it is about 9 milreis to the dollar, or transposed, within 90 days Brazil's money has advanced from slightly less than 9 cents per milreis to fully 11 cents, or approximately 25 per cent, within these three months. This is highly indicative of Brazil's fiscal improvement.

Everyone believes the milreis will further advance within the next few months through Brazil's steady and increasing prosperity, and it would appear that the Brazilian Government itself is purposely keeping the milreis rate down to avert chaos or almost ruin of import merchants, by giving them an opportunity of disposing of their United States or other foreign purchases engaged at a time when they had to establish the dollar value on a 11½ milreis rate and resell in milreis on their present value.

For example, Brown & Jones, of Rio de Janeiro, purchased 10 Ford cars on December 15 last at a cost of \$300 each. It took 34,500 milreis to make the purchase. To-day the same 10 cars could be bought for approximately 27,000 milreis, and naturally potential buyers, alert to the greater buying strength of their milreis, would be prone to purchase only on a percentage profit over present established import costs.

The same table applies on almost every article imported, so that it well behooves the Brazilian Government to gradually adjust their milreis worth to relieve financial stress, particularly in a city like Rio de Janeiro, which is largely dependent on its merchandizing import resales.

But this table is again reversed in its application to coffee, which in most instances was purchased some months ago from growers or commissarios in milreis, then withheld in Government warehouses until its arrival in Santos, and automatically gold-price exactions are calculated on their milreis convertibility, or, possibly more clearly expressed, three months ago \$1 would buy 11½ milreis' worth of coffee; to-day but 9 milreis' worth, or a 25 per cent enhancement through exchange fluctuations.

This Federal administration is pledged and is rigidly adhering to a most economical and conservative budget policy. Dr. Arturo Bernardes, President of Brazil, and his entire Federal cabinet are immensely popular, and during his less than two years of office exports have multiplied in volume and value, while imports have perceptibly decreased. It is reported that Brazil's paper currency issues are being steadily recalled, with present currency outstanding (paper) of only 2,400,000 contos do reis, or at the rate of 8 milreis to the dollar \$300,000,000 gold, or about the export value of one coffee crop, so that their financial problems appear extremely ably managed and well within ultraconservative bounds. To better substantiate their prosperity in Sao Paulo alone, the second largest city of Brazil, with a population of over 800,000, there is a new building being completed for every hour of every day for more than a year past. Property values in this city have multiplied three and four times in the last five years.

With these apparently temptingly high prices for coffee, which now appear as being assured for at least two years or more to come, the inference might be that an era of overproduction could be influenced and expected, but experienced and expert investigators on this score predict a far greater probability of underproduction, their beliefs being predicated on the development of other crops and their accompanying manufacturing industries in Brazil.

It is most surprising to find in research that coffee production in Brazil has not materially increased in the last 20 years. In fact, certain of the choicest quality producing districts now only produce a little more than half the quantity of coffee per thousand trees compared with the production of the same trees 5 or 10 years ago. Many fazendas still show the stunted effect of the frost of about five years ago, and in frequent instances coffee plantations in frost districts have been supplanted with sugar. The production of sugar has advanced in leaps and bounds. Last year one prominent coffee planter produced 80,000 bags of sugar with more profit, less merchandising and labor difficulty, from land which until the big frost was considered one of the best coffee fazendas in Brazil.

As recently as 10 years ago Brazil imported all their rice, which is consumed in a very large way by all their immigrant labor, as well as the native Brazilians; but in the past three years they not alone have grown enough for their own consumption but are seeking and in a position to export surplus quantities.

Of far greater importance than either rice or sugar is cotton, which has passed the experimental stage in Brazil, and unquestionably the next few years will see a development in cotton growing and cotton manufacture in Brazil which will put that country on a competitive cotton-growing basis with the balance of the cotton-producing world.

Great Britain is assisting and fostering this development on a very broad financial scale. This industry, too, has been started within the past 10 years.

Cotton, like sugar, can be raised on coffee land, and many believe that it is destined to ultimately exceed coffee in importance and become a more powerful trade factor.

Formerly Brazil imported hosiery and all other cotton goods. She is now exporting manufactured cotton goods in steadily growing quantities on both a favorable quality and price basis.

Good coffee land is good cotton land, and the latter requires far less care and labor; it matures before the frost season, eliminating grave coffee concern, and this fact in itself bids fair to give coffee growing a race for supremacy.

These diversified crop reports are only chronicled as food for thought regarding coffee overproduction.

#### BRAZIL'S OFFICIAL PURPOSE TO PROTECT FARMERS.

At present, the next Brazil coffee crop appears to be in size a most weighty one for Government control and accompanying Federal, merchant, and farmer prosperity. Since all wealth originates in the soil or has a direct relation thereto, it seems Brazil's official purpose is to protect and serve their farmer element.

The cost of production of coffee in Brazil has increased at least 300 per cent in five years past. Their labor question is a most serious and vital one, since the pinch of high prices for maintenance through the declining buying power of the milreis, coupled with labor's realization that in the rapid development of agricultural and industrial Brazil the demand for labor greatly exceeded the supply, as well as the modern application in their demands, as experienced in the United States, for an improved standard of living, have furnished a cause and effect playing a very important factor in production costs.

Labor is hardly secondary to capital in Brazil's development needs. It is of record in our report of December 20, last, how Brazil is spending money and effort to attract immigration. Their willingness to defray transportation costs for families, with propagandists sent to Spain, Portugal, Italy, Japan, and elsewhere for this purpose. Some four or five years ago there was a large influx of Japanese, but as they did not thrive in health through primitive sanitation, yellow fever, typhus, and other tropical ailments, the Japanese as a class have almost wholly migrated. Decided headway is being made, however, to improve sanitation and in eliminating conditions which have thwarted agricultural and industrial development, and the Rockefeller Institute has recently done exceptional cooperative work with Brazilian medicos toward the extermination of the mosquito and other germ carriers, such as was done so successfully in Panama, Ecuador, Chile, and other tropical American countries.

#### COFFEE-DEFENSE PLAN POPULAR.

The coffee-defense plan, with its already proven, highly successful effect, is not only most popular with the farmer but with bankers, commissarios, as well as the Federal administration in its accompanying national prosperity. No one has suffered in Brazil except the bearish exporting speculators and the skeptical world's buying clientele, more pronouncedly so in the United States than in Europe, and who seemingly will not accept the facts and adjust their positions to cope therewith.

Up to March 1, 1924, there has been exported something over six and one-half million bags of coffee from Santos of the remaining quantity of this supposed 15,000,000-bag crop. The distribution is about as follows:

	Bags.
In Government warehouses in the interior.....	2,500,000
In railroad stations and in transit to Government warehouses.....	1,250,000
Stock in Santos.....	750,000
Stock in Sao Paulo.....	500,000
On growing fazendas, 2,500,000 to.....	3,500,000

A total of 7,500,000 to..... 8,500,000

The two and one-half to three and one-half million bags on plantations is almost all unusable black-beaned, rain-damaged truck, and a large percentage will, as has been the custom for many years, be thrown back in the soil to act as a fertilizer.

Much of the coffee in the Government warehouses has already been rebagged through its soggy condition and through the rain damage puffing the bags to a bursting point.

It is still the belief and consensus of opinion that all of this crop which fazenderos care to ship and enter into Government warehouses must and will have precedence over the new-crop coffees, which will be harvested and start for the Government warehouses in June or July next; and while there is some agitation on the part of exporters to request the Government to allow a percentage of new-crop coffee in the daily entries at Santos, few think any heed will be given, as such a move would serve to shatter confidence, and particularly so since the present perfected plans and organization are proving so satisfactory and profitable.

A fortnight's grading during February of each day's 35,000-bag entries into Santos by one of the largest exporting interests resulted in the following classifications:

Bags grading 4's and above	10,500
Bags grading 5's to 7's	18,000
Bags grading 7's and below	6,500

Other thoroughly reliable exporting interests state that not even 20 per cent of 7,000 bags are "soft" 4's and above.

Several recent block purchases made in Santos by exporters necessitated the buying of at least 40 per cent low-grade rain-damaged coffee, and fully 30 per cent of mediocre hard-drinking undesirables to secure 30 per cent of real quality selections. Buying exporters frankly state and show cause not warranting purchases as just enumerated as even the present premium differentials for a real quality 4 of as much as 1½ to 2 cents over a hard, mediocre 4 does not offset the quantity or quality of almost unusable trash which is accumulating in Santos and which they apparently must take in to get coffee which will pass muster in import markets where past descriptions are taken as a test criterion.

The next Santos crop of 1924-25 is, of course, variously estimated. A consensus of opinion seems to be six to seven million bags, some insisting 6,500,000 to be a maximum, while the highest estimate heard was 8,000,000.

The next Rio crop can not be over 3,000,000, probably not over 2,500,000 bags.

In the face of the above it would appear that the present and immediate future independence of Brazil, so far as their coffee crops are concerned, is practically invulnerable, and as Europe is now looming up as an increasingly important buying factor—in fact, most surprisingly so from both a quantity and quality viewpoint, during our stay of about three weeks European buying was more than two bags to one of the United States—surely United States buyers have a most decidedly increased disturbing factor in any nearby or prolonged hopes for a material price relief.

In our opinion Brazil undoubtedly will be the theater of enormous commercial development within the next decade. They are proceeding and progressing most orderly, sanely, and still most rapidly. With regard to its coffee-crop movements their problems seem past ones. The almost astounding success of this last defense movement accomplished without the assistance of outside management or capital, and with the modern and permanent interior warehouse system, affording such complete control, every indication would point that any future problem is already anticipated and guaranteed by a perfected Gibraltared defense fort. All coffee grown on individually owned plantations must go into the most adjacent Government warehouses to await its turn of allotment and shipment to the seaport, Santos, from which it is exported, each of the interior Government warehouses being assigned a weekly proportion, according to stocks, to make up 35,000 bags daily to Santos. Farmers are advanced money on their Government warehouse stocks, or even before harvesting, by commissarios or bankers, usually about half the selling worth, until convertible into sales at Santos by export sales.

C. E. BICKFORD & CO.  
By E. H. O'BRIEN.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I desire for a few moments to discuss the matter of law enforcement.

I am an old-fashioned American. I believe in the Government and Constitution established by the fathers. I believe in the Government upheld and adhered to by George Washington; I believe in the Government loved and defended by Andrew Jackson. I believe in the Government that had its very origin in the principles announced by Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. I believe in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and believe it should be enforced.

A multitude of suggestions have recently been made for raising revenue, and it has been suggested that a tax be levied on malt liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol.

I think the lawyers of the House agree that this suggestion is untenable, unless Congress first change the provisions of the national prohibition act and the States change the provisions of their State codes. It would be entirely impracticable for Congress to lay a tax on beer of a higher voltage than one-half of 1 per cent as long as the national prohibition act prohibits such beer, or, if that act were repealed, if such beer were still prohibited in many States of the Union.

The question we have to decide here in Congress is not primarily whether or not a certain amount of alcohol in wine or beer will actually intoxicate those who drink, but our responsi-

bility is to determine what legislation is necessary to enforce the eighteenth amendment and make the necessary appropriations to carry out the intent of the act.

The second section of the eighteenth amendment says:

The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has clearly stated that the eighteenth amendment—

Binds all legislative bodies, \* \* \* and of its own force invalidates every legislative act which authorizes or sanctions what the section prohibits.

It also says that the second section of the amendment—

Does not enable Congress or the several States to defeat or thwart the prohibition, but only to enforce it by appropriate means.

In other words, our responsibility is to determine what kind of legislation is required to make this amendment effective. I think the people in the States which ratified the eighteenth amendment through their legislatures expected us to take into consideration their experience in enforcing prohibition in the States. They knew what legislation was appropriate and necessary. Thirty-three of the States had adopted prohibition, 30 of them defining intoxicating liquor as that containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol. Only three States had a 1 per cent standard, and none of them a larger standard than 1 per cent.

It is interesting to note that in a number of these States, after they had adopted prohibition with a one-half of 1 per cent standard, they later on prohibited all alcoholic liquors when efforts were made to raise the amount of alcohol permitted in beverages under the law. Instead of increasing the amount of alcohol, they have with practical uniformity decreased it, and now 15 States have prohibited all liquors containing any alcohol.

There is one thing we have to face in determining this question, namely, that Congress can not legalize any liquor which the States prohibit. With two-thirds of the States, or more, prohibiting one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol, it would be inconsistent for Congress, under an amendment intended to bring about uniformity of prohibition enforcement, to repeal the law so that a very few States might allow liquors of a greater alcoholic content to be sold. This would not only destroy uniformity of operation, but would handicap the enforcement of the law in the adjoining States where liquor with this larger per cent of alcoholic content was not legalized, because this liquor would be transported into the States where the State law did not permit its manufacture.

The question involved in this controversy, then, is a question of supporting the Constitution and the laws pursuant thereto. This part of the Constitution was adopted by a larger majority than any other. The prohibition question has been before the public ever since 1777, when the Colonial Congress passed a bone-dry resolution, urging the Colonies to prohibit the sale of liquors. From that day to this it has been before the American people. Ninety-five per cent of the territory of the Nation was dry before the eighteenth amendment was adopted. Seventy per cent of the people lived in this dry territory. The eighteenth amendment to the Constitution was the resultant of a steady growth of sentiment against what the people considered a recognized evil. Now that it is written into the Constitution, it ought to be enforced and it ought to be obeyed by both friends and foes of prohibition.

The President of the United States said recently:

A government which does not enforce its laws is unworthy of the name of a government, and can not expect to hold either the support of its own citizens or the respect of the informed opinion of the world.

On another occasion President Coolidge said with reference to our Constitution:

The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen. So long as it is observed these rights will be secure. Whenever it falls into disrepute the end of the orderly organized Government, as we have known it for more than 125 years, will be at hand.

Chief Justice William Howard Taft, of the Supreme Court, expressed it in this way:

One who, in the matter of national prohibition, holds his personal opinion and his claim of personal liberty to be of higher sanction than the overwhelming constitutional expression of the people is a disciple of practical Bolshevism.

Mr. Taft also said in addressing the Washington Branch of the Yale Alumni Association:



The safety of society is in obedience to the law. If you like the law or not, as long as it is regularly adopted it is our business to obey it.

As I look at it, the question has now resolved itself into one of law enforcement, and upon this issue there ought to be no difference of opinion among loyal, patriotic citizens. As Members of Congress, we take an oath of office to support the Constitution without mental reservation or purpose of evasion. Every citizen of the United States is bound by the very terms of his citizenship to support the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto. We can not defy the prohibition law and expect others to obey other laws. We should make liberal appropriation for its enforcement. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STENGLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have been fearful of late that I might be looked upon by my colleagues as somewhat of a nuisance because of my frequent appearance on the floor of this House, being only a first-term Member. But I believe, my friends, that when measures are brought before us for consideration with which we have close-up acquaintanceship, and of which we have direct knowledge, it is our duty one to the other to occupy at least a small part of the time allotted to the bill in order to give to our colleagues the benefit of our experience and the additional knowledge which we may possess. I did not know until a few minutes ago that I was to be on this list of speakers to-day, and therefore I shall be compelled to speak extemporaneously. But I shall extend my remarks so that when I have finished the subject that I want to discuss I shall at least have placed in our public Record sufficient reason why you should vote as I shall now ask you.

If you will turn to page 6 of this bill, beginning with line 1 and ending with line 10, you will find the title, "Bureau of Efficiency," and beneath that a description of the disposition of \$155,650, plus \$500 for printing, a total of \$156,150.

My friends, efficiency in public service is extremely desirable. No man in his right senses believes that any public servant, whether he holds elective office or appointive position, ought to be inefficient and remain in the public service; and I never have, since I have been here, attempted to create the impression that I was against the highest class of efficient service on the part of our public employees. What I do hesitate about, what I do stop seriously to think of, is the method and manner by which the ratings, and from such ratings promotions, are made among the 55,000 or 60,000 civil employees in this District and the more than 200,000 throughout the country.

In a former brief address to this body I pointed out to you that throughout the United States, in every civil-service commission of this country having any standing at all, the question of efficiency is a part and parcel of the employment and promotion arrived at in a civil-service commission; and in the Federal employment, up until the year 1916, it was then a part and parcel of the civil-service work of this District and of this Nation.

But during that year he who was its chief in a division of the Civil Service Commission had a falling out with the commissioners, and finding that he could not be the boss of the establishment, sought influence enough to tack onto an urgent deficiency appropriation bill that passed through this House a paragraph of legislation which has been decried here day after day in this session, and by a legislative enactment attached to a deficiency bill for appropriations he separated the Bureau of Efficiency and made it an independent establishment. From that day to this the records will show that the efficiency rating of Federal employees has been anything but fair and just.

It is not a personal fight with me. Lord bless you, if I never talked about it again I would live and be happy, but I hate to see good, valuable, honest, loyal, and faithful public servants, such as we have in this District and in the United States, so maligned, abused, and mistreated without a word of protest from any public man. [Applause.]

My office hours have been filled in the last few weeks and my mail has been heavily weighted with complaints of bad treatment, by this bureau, of very faithful public servants in this District. I only ask for fair play. I only seek justice at this time at your hands.

Oh, somebody will say, "You do not represent the District of Columbia. Why do you take so much interest?" I hold, gentlemen, that every one of the 435 Congressmen is a representative of the District of Columbia in addition to his own home district.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENGLE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. STEVENSON. And is it not a fact also that the civil-service employees are supposed to be apportioned amongst all the districts in proportion to population and, therefore, all of us have our proportion of employees here whom we represent and who have been imposed upon by this gang?

Mr. STENGLE. Yes. And in addition thereto you have your proportion of responsibility for what is going on in this District.

Now, we have heard a lot about the equality of allocation recently. We have heard considerable discussion about how much increase we could afford to give to the various departments of our Nation. We have heard it said that "You are asking too much here and there." I want to put this statement in the Record, and I want you to hear it, because it is the gospel truth: The Bureau of Efficiency to-day has an average salary among its employees of \$2,910, and throughout the Nation the average is less than \$1,700. Is that fair? Is it just? "Oh," but says somebody, "these are experts that they have there"; but the experts about whom we hear so much were drafted from other departments and brought into this small circle to do the bidding of one who ought not to be obeyed.

Now, I rise at this time to invite the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that at the proper time I shall move to strike out that entire paragraph and transfer the Bureau of Efficiency to the Civil Service Commission, where it belongs. Where are the economists of this House? Where are those who are daily harping about saving the public funds? Here is \$156,000 that you can put back where it belongs and still conduct the public business, still have efficiency ratings, still have faithful public service, and have things done squarely and honestly.

I have introduced a bill for the abolishment of this bureau, and I have been unofficially informed that that bill will be favorably reported in a short while. But I want to anticipate the abolishment of that bureau by law by striking out the appropriation, so that if, because of the press of business, it becomes necessary to sidetrack the bill introduced in its proper channel we can sidetrack this bureau by taking this money away from it and transferring its duties where they legitimately belong.

There are departments under this Government that have not the same kind of service ratings as other departments have. We established here a Bureau of Efficiency and gave it authority to direct the service ratings of the Nation, and yet right here in this town is a large department that refused to be directed and was never forced to be directed. I refer to the Treasury Department under Secretary Mellon. And yet every man and woman who expects or ever hopes to be promoted from one grade to another or be transferred from one department to another is dependent upon an honest and fair rating for the service he or she performs.

Oh, it makes me sick as I think about it, and I have had fond hopes that maybe before this session adjourns I might arouse a sufficient interest among my colleagues to put a stop to this first-class farce that is being conducted under the guise of a Government bureau. I ask you now to consider well everything I have said prior to the five-minute rule on this bill.

Read up and investigate so as to determine whether I am speaking the truth or not. If I am, support that amendment when it comes up in its proper form, but if I am not, arise on this floor, point to me and call me a faker, if you like, but I know that the records will speak for themselves and I ask nothing better than the cold-type records. [Applause.]

The efficiency rating plan was adopted in 1913, when it became a part of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, and directions were then plainly given that the Civil Service Commission should establish a system of service ratings based upon "records of facts" kept in each department of the Government, but after three years the then director of this work, who is now the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, found that he could not run the place to suit himself. He accordingly rushed to Capitol Hill, and

with the aid and assistance of "friends" had a rider attached to the urgent deficiency bill making the division of efficiency an independent bureau with himself in absolute control. Since then things have been going from bad to worse, and the appropriations for this work increased from about \$45,000 to \$156,150 per annum. I regret to say that owing to a rule of this House I am forbidden to tell you who the "moving spirit" behind all of this high-handed work really is, but if I were permitted to reveal some facts in my possession you would not be very proud of some men who attempt to legislate for the Nation.

It seems passing strange, also, that in his mad rush to "steal" the efficiency division from the Civil Service Commission this "master artist in service rating" forgot to have transferred the following law which would have been extremely helpful to friends of honest government at this time:

Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this section shall be summarily removed from office, and may also upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year.

One has only to check up a little on the condition of things in the departments located here in the District of Columbia, as I have honestly done, to thoroughly convince himself that there surely is something "rotten in Denmark." Only this week three very competent employees of one of these departments called to see me and gave me tangible evidence of "foul play" in their bureau—evidence which would convince any fair-minded person that favoritism was running rampant and prejudice not far in the rear—and on the very next day one of these employees was transferred to another bureau for "the good of the service." In other words, it seems to be looked upon as a crime for any employee to visit a Congressman in the interest of justice.

I rejoice, gentlemen, that the day of reckoning seems near at hand. The House Committee on Civil Service has reported out, unanimously, a bill for the abolishment of the Personnel Classification Board, a twin sister in "crime" of the Bureau of Efficiency, and I am promised that my bill for the abolishment of the Bureau of Efficiency will likewise be reported favorably in a few days.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope and pray that every Member of this House will rise above every consideration other than justice and fair play and look these two bills squarely in the face, for upon their enactment into law lies all hope for an honest disposition of the "mess" into which matters in our public service have been placed.

Let us go on record as the friends of loyal, faithful, and efficient civil servants, and the enemies of those who would use public office as a private snap. Let us announce to the "swell-headed" bureau chief that favoritism will not go in American public service, that all decisions in service ratings must be based upon actual facts and not upon likes or dislikes of those working under their supervision. If we do this, colleagues, you and I will soon see a vast improvement in the public service. Otherwise, matters will go from bad to worse until soon we shall behold our army of Government servants thoroughly discouraged and disheartened, with those remaining in the service driven from pillar to post like slaves under the master's whip.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from New York, who last spoke, said of public servants who are not appreciated, because I desire to speak of a public servant who, to my mind, has rendered a great service to his country and who, I feel, has not been appreciated, at least, if we take the tone of the press or judge from the newspapers and magazines of the country, which have failed to do him justice.

It is needless for me to say to the House that I do not always agree with the distinguished Republican leader, Mr. LONGWORTH. In fact, in legislative matters I have been trained in an entirely different school, that places no stamp of partisanship on ordinary legislation and refuses to obey the party lash whether wielded here or by the invisible government that would control congressional action. I have frequently disagreed with Mr. LONGWORTH in matters of political and legislative policy, notably on many features of recent tax legislation.

After several years' association on the same committee I can say, however, I know the majority leader, respect his squareness of dealings, admire his ability, and believe that few men

could have brought order out of threatened chaos as well as the majority leader. Few men could have retained the respect of all their colleagues on both sides of the aisle under similar circumstances, and few men could have secured equal constructive legislation if subjected to the same conditions.

I have waited for some one better able and more qualified to speak in reply to unwarranted attacks in the press and from short-sighted partisanship occurring in my own party directed against the majority leader, but after reasonable delay I believe a brief word is proper for me to say.

Mr. Chairman, Leader LONGWORTH's principal defense in the eyes of extreme critics seems to be that he has not led his party colleagues into a position where political suicide would be invited and that he would not obey the positive commands issued outside of Congress. Further than that, he has not followed the dictates of Mr. Mellon and Wall Street interests so conspicuously represented on this floor during discussion of the tax bill. I submit, however, it is true that he did secure a tax bill several hundred per cent better than the Treasury bill then placed before us for passage.

The so-called Mellon bill was drafted without any committee hearings to relieve a handful of multimillionaires from present surtaxes, drawn by no one knows who or when or where, and opposed to elementary principles of taxation. It would not have received a handful of votes upon this floor excepting for the most terrific and expensive propaganda in all recent history pressed by beneficiaries who largely own or control the newspapers and leading magazines of the country.

The passage of the Mellon plan, it has been stated by the press, was to be a condition precedent for making campaign contributions by contributors who confidently expected Congress to indorse the plan.

Leader LONGWORTH knew the folly of that policy and did what any statesmanlike leader would do. He refused to obey such orders, secured the best tax reduction bill ever passed by the House, and the character of his leadership is evidenced by a vote of 408 out of 416 votes, or a practically unanimous vote of the House. The bill passed was a fair compromise, and gives relief to over 95 per cent of the Federal taxpayers of the country compared with less than 5 per cent who would have received larger tax plums if the Mellon plan had passed.

If Leader LONGWORTH—and I note he is here—and I am complimented by his presence—if he does nothing more in his legislative career toward passing needed constructive legislation, he is entitled to the thanks of the country this early in the session for his record of leadership on the tax bill and soldiers' bonus bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH's immediate predecessor, with 165 working majority last session, supported by personal letters from the President read on this floor, repeatedly failed to secure demanded legislation on the dye embargo, surtax reduction, retroactive repeal of the excess profits law, and other measures, whereas Leader LONGWORTH, with a bare majority under unrestricted liberal rules, refused to ditch legislation, as urged by hot-heads, or to sacrifice everything to placate a few disappointed critics. He helped pass constructive legislation by wise and conciliatory leadership supported by a majority of Members composed of all factions.

I do not care to discuss unfair criticisms from those who have little influence with Congress. From the apricot, apple, McLean Post, or the antibonus, sales tax, Mellon tax press that threatens no campaign funds unless Congress toes the mark, the propaganda and criticisms are generally found to be from the same mold.

Criticisms of Mr. LONGWORTH and of Congress will continue on the tax and bonus bills until the issue is made plain and conditional political contributions are placed before the country with real interests disclosed. Politics and partisanship has run mad when the country is deluged with propaganda to pass a tax bill in order to squeeze out of closed pocketbooks enough campaign funds to run one or both of the political parties. Leader LONGWORTH refused to be driven, and he is entitled to congratulations from every Member of this House and from the country for his decision not to permit the American Congress to become a pawnbroker or fairy godfather for campaign contributors.

Whatever the motive governing his action, Mr. LONGWORTH has not been driven, but on the contrary he has led the House to pass the most constructive and equitable tax reduction bill in all history. If that be party treason, then he may well say, Make the most of it.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the discarded, selfish Mellon tax-reduction plan so many times and it has received such emphatic repudiations here and is so certain of like treatment by the Senate that a post-mortem on the subject is unnecessary.



Tax reduction is now before another body, and through the press the country was recently informed by a distinguished gentleman from a western State that gave Mr. Taft half of his eight electoral votes, that the House tax bill we passed would cause a Treasury deficit of \$100,000,000. Secretary Mellon more recently testified before the Senate committee that any deficit from the bill we passed would reach only \$55,000,000, and this was followed by Treasury estimates of greater receipts than previously offered in the House. Next, the press advised the country that the same authority had announced that the bonus bill passed by the House would cost the Government nearly \$5,000,000,000, instead of \$2,100,000,000, as shown by the Legion actuary. In arriving at this figure numerous controverted items, with accumulated interest for 20 years, were added.

On the same basis a \$21,000,000,000 national debt is not a \$21,000,000,000 debt, because added interest will make the obligation \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 in years to come, depending on time of payment, just as the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. GREEN], who is present, has disclosed in the press in his answers to misstatements put forth in committee at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My understanding is that the Treasury has practically abandoned the figures which were given on the bonus, conceding that they are very erroneous.

Mr. FREAR. And I say further the Treasury alone was not responsible for the incorrect and misleading figures which were given to the press, judging from the announcements made by one gentleman at the other end of the Capitol.

Testimony, estimates, and tax rates reached by proxy methods or such guesswork are willfully unfair and are offered for the purpose of misrepresenting to the country the real facts in issue.

It is said in the press that campaign contributors toward both parties are willing to have the tax reduction bill as passed by the House defeated or vetoed, provided the 25 per cent horizontal tax cut for 1923 and 1924, proposed by Chairman GREEN of our committee, can be separated from the bill.

And let me say in passing that the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. GREEN] is the one who proposed that tax-reduction plan reaching \$200,000,000 for 1923 and 1924, and caused it to be inserted in the bill. It never came from the President of the United States nor from Secretary Mellon nor anyone else originally, and Chairman GREEN deserves whatever credit there is for it. [Applause.]

Papers that insist we should pass the Coolidge or Mellon proposal do not know or care to know the facts.

If taken out of the bill, this plan would leave a generous share of \$200,000,000 refund from the Treasury that would find its way back to the pockets of the proposed campaign contributors during the next two years, but defeat the \$400,000,000 annual tax reduction as passed by the House. In other words, the so-called Mellon plan proponents and Wall Street interests, it is said, will permit no permanent tax reduction law this session unless the original indefensible Mellon plan is accepted by Congress. They will ask for a 25 per cent reduction for 1923 and 1924, which is concededly a political bid at Treasury expense that can be characterized by a far uglier word. With \$21,000,000,000 national indebtedness and a soldiers' bonus bill passed up to the President, why is the 25 per cent temporary reduction now urged by the same interests that once urged the Mellon plan, and why do they oppose the tax cut bill as passed by the House?

Mr. Chairman, if tax-free securities could be taxed by direct law, as I proposed when the tax bill was before the House, or if the abnormal excess profits could be taxed, or if undistributed profits that go to make up stock dividends could be taxed, or if higher inheritance-tax rates and gift taxes can be imposed, we will be able to stop large tax evasions, and under the inheritance and gift taxes reach tax-free securities that now escape.

Mr. Mellon and those who press his proposed tax relief bill are all opposed to this kind of a real tax on big business, even as they oppose relief for the smaller taxpayers. Every amendment proposed in the House was opposed by such interests.

But we did pass a compromise tax bill that gave over 50 per cent tax cut to 3,500,000 small taxpayers, and that is the bill that is now before the Senate for action.

I wish you would pay attention to this further fact, my friends, because I believe it is the vital part of the whole tax proposition now pending in the Senate. If the tax bill passed by the House should fail to pass the Senate or should pass the Senate and then be vetoed, and the 25 per cent Treasury grab

is passed in its stead, it will mean that the American public will not have any real tax-reduction measure for two years—and I am indebted for the reminder to a suggestion from our distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. GREEN—and the \$400,000,000 annual tax reduction proposal passed by the House will be defeated, forsooth, because the Mellon rates were not placed in the bill and because an inheritance tax and gift tax have been inserted.

Mr. Chairman, a defeat or veto of the \$400,000,000 annual tax reduction bill will mean that all nuisance taxes will remain as in the present law undisturbed. The candy tax, the jewelry tax, the movie tax that earned a liberal reduction through Mellon-plan propaganda, the \$23,000,000 tax reduction for automobiles, all will remain a burden to the country. The 25 per cent reduction on earned incomes and the 50 per cent reduction in income-tax rates for 3,500,000 taxpayers will also be defeated because comparatively a handful of men are disappointed in their Mellon tax-propaganda investment. The inheritance tax, gift tax, and partial publicity of records will all go the same way.

Forgetting the repeal of the \$450,000,000 excess-profits tax and \$50,000,000 surtax reduction secured by them from Congress last session, these same interests now selfishly demand the major part of the next tax cut. Let responsibility rest where it may eventually belong if real tax reduction fails, but I pause a moment to congratulate the Republican leader of the House, who secured 408 votes, an unprecedented number, for the best and greatest tax reduction bill ever passed by the House, a bill that benefits primarily the man least able to pay but lifts tax burdens for all.

I congratulate any man who can hold together in a fairly good working organization 435 Republicans and Democrats of widely divergent views and who enjoys the respect and confidence of every man of the House because of his frankness and fair dealing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. WOOD. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That was an accomplishment which the leader could never have performed if he had not himself been so enthusiastic for those rates, was it not?

Mr. FREAR. I will say this to my friend from Texas, and I am very glad he suggested it, knowing, as I happen to know, the means by which we reached a compromise: That the Republican leader went more than halfway. And it required a strong effort, because he was pulled upon hard from all sides. I happen to know the situation, because others of us were much in the same position, but we finally reached a compromise supported in the House by 408 votes. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. You are doing pretty well. I did not rise to interrupt you.

Mr. FREAR. I assumed the gentleman did; and let me say that the gentleman from Nebraska has spoken some strong words on the tax bill that have been of value.

I congratulate the House and the country that the Republican leader refused to permit Mr. Mellon or Wall Street or any other outside interest to dictate his course.

I believe I voice the good will and high respect of every Member of the House in giving this halting testimonial from one who has frequently differed from the Republican leader but who has never found him wanting in fairness or in the qualities that make for successful leadership. It is easy to criticize but hard to construct. The respect and confidence of the House means more to the leader and to the country than any approval that could come to him outside these walls, for without such possessions legislation must falter or fail, while with them all heights of leadership and accomplishment are possible. That is one secret of Leader LONGWORTH's success. We respect him for the enemies he has made and for the good work he has done.

I am reminded of a letter which was handed me as I arose a few moments ago by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], who is here, dated Chicago, March 20, 1924, wherein it is stated:

We suggest again that Republican contributors to party funds study the action of Mr. GREEN, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a Republican; Mr. LONGWORTH, leader of the Republicans in the House, a Republican; and Mr. FREAR, leader of the radicals, who was elected

as a Republican, and then decide how much money they want to waste on a party which has this brand of leadership. Let us be practical, gentlemen.

This remarkable advice is signed by a gentleman named William H. Barr, president of the National Founders' Association, who complains of you, my distinguished leader, of your attitude and of that of the chairman of my committee [Mr. GREEN], as well as of my humble self and of all you gentlemen who helped to prevent the adoption of the so-called Mellon plan, which would have enabled them to reap a rich harvest and then to make these generous contributions of which he speaks in this letter.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to make a few remarks concerning the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. Notwithstanding the fact that I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations I do not agree to the appropriation that is carried in this bill for the Federal Trade Commission. When this bill is reached for amendment, I intend to offer on page 11, line 16, the following amendment: Strike out the figures "\$680,200," and insert in lieu thereof "\$885,200," which is really the appropriation that is carried for the current year.

I feel if there is one Government agency that earns all it gets in the way of an appropriation it is the Federal Trade Commission; and, for one, I am opposed to the cut in the appropriation, as proposed in this bill, of about \$200,000.

I am aware of the fact there are certain interests in this Nation that would be glad—yes, extremely happy—if Congress would entirely wipe out the appropriation and say to this commission, "Close shop." I do not infer the Appropriations Committee has any desire to do this, nor do I feel there is any disposition on the part of this committee, or any member of it, to cripple the commission. This cut in the appropriation asked for by the commission is a desire to economize, to curtail governmental expenses. I am just as anxious to do this as any member of the Appropriations Committee, but in doing so I want the cut to come from an appropriation of some agency not so essential to the public good and public welfare as the Federal Trade Commission.

If I had the time I could and would go into detail and show what was done by this commission during the war in aiding the various Government agencies to ascertain the cost of production. This was very essential when these agencies were endeavoring to curb the profiteer. They were helpless in many instances but for the faithful Federal Trade Commission. I have not the time on this occasion to go into that, but I may some day when Congress is asked to provide greater powers to this commission, which I hope will be before the adjournment of the present session.

Now, as to the question before us, the contention is made that because we have offered a provision that any resolution passed calling for an investigation should be passed by both Houses of Congress as a joint resolution, carrying with it an appropriation to meet the expenses of same, will very materially reduce the present expenses of the commission; therefore, the appropriation called for at this time should be reduced accordingly.

I am speaking of this provision as suggested in the pending bill:

*Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations directed by the President or either House of Congress except those authorized by law.*

This means that in case an investigation is called for by a resolution passed either by this House or the other body, no part of this fund shall be used unless it is a joint resolution.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. I notice that the provision you have just quoted is not contained in the law passed by the last Congress.

Mr. AYRES. No.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Why was it inserted here?

Mr. AYRES. For the reason it was intended to reduce the appropriation in the neighborhood of \$315,000; it is claimed that would be about the amount that these congressional investigations entailed in the way of expense, and that if a joint resolution should be passed, of course, under the proposed provision, it would carry with it an appropriation sufficient to meet the expense of the investigation called for by the joint resolution.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Would not that hamper the work of the Federal Trade Commission in making their investigations about violations of the antitrust laws, and so forth?

Mr. AYRES. The cases pending at the present time?

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. I mean with the appropriation provided for in the bill.

Mr. AYRES. It is my contention it would; yes. There is a further provision also suggested in this bill that this limitation shall not apply to investigations in progress on April 1, 1924; but, notwithstanding this provision, I can not agree with the members of the Appropriations Committee holding these views, for two good reasons: First, there is no assurance that the other branch of Congress will agree to this provision. As a matter of fact, I do not think it will; and should it agree that all resolutions passed by Congress calling for an investigation shall be joint resolutions carrying with them the necessary appropriation to defray the expenses of such investigation, it will not take care of all demands made on this commission, from an official standpoint. The President frequently calls on the Federal Trade Commission to make investigations. Some will say he can pay the expenses of such investigation out of his contingent fund. That may be true; but suppose he does not, and it may be he will not be so inclined. I do not know of any way of compelling him to do so, and therefore it will have to come out of the commission's funds. That is not all. The President and the Senate frequently call on this commission to furnish experts for various things to assist senatorial and presidential investigations not carried on by the Federal Trade Commission, but by the Senate or the President, as is being done at this time.

The commission is trying to get at the investigation of the increase of the price of gasoline in South Dakota upon the order of the President, at the request of the governor of that State, and also the Senate oil investigating committee is using, or has been using, several of the commission's best men on this investigation that has been going on for weeks. It can not be expected that when a demand is made on the commission by the President or a committee of either branch of Congress for some experts to look up some matter, that the commission will decline to comply with the demand. That is my first reason, or reasons. Second, even should this provision be passed compelling all joint resolutions to carry appropriations to defray the expenses, it certainly would do no good to pass such resolutions with appropriations as stated to make these investigations if the commission had no force to conduct an investigation. Suppose that this appropriation is decreased so that the commission is unable to carry a sufficient corps of efficient experts to conduct these investigations when ordered, it had just as well close its doors. Should there be two or three investigations ordered by joint resolutions, with appropriations sufficient to meet the expense, the commission can not go out and find efficient experts to put on the work, because it is a well-known fact that it is impossible for any governmental agency to go out and compete with the business world in securing expert accountants and other experts for the salary the Government pays. As a matter of fact, that is one of the troubles of this commission; it can not hold its good men at the salaries paid, because big business concerns pay three and four times as much salary for such services.

Therefore, it seems that anyone can readily see that for this commission to take care of the work that is coming to it daily from the business world it should be equipped not only to do this efficiently, but prepared also to take care, at all times, of any demand made by the President or Congress.

If this commission could devote all its time exclusively to the cases or applications it has on hand at the present time, and nothing else submitted to it, it would take 18 months to catch up. That condition, gentlemen, should not exist. This is the business man's commission. That is the legitimate business man's agency. Of course, the profiteers and combines would be happy to see this commission so far behind it could never get at them.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Did the Budget recommend this decrease?

Mr. AYRES. No. The Budget recommended a decrease of about \$60,000. This would be a decrease of over \$200,000.

Mr. TINCHER. And does your amendment put it back to the amount recommended by the Budget?

Mr. AYRES. It provides for the same appropriation as the current year, which is about \$60,000 more than the Budget recommended. The appropriation should be for more than carried for the present or current year, but my amendment is to put it back to the same amount, as I have said, as the current



year. And let me say the commission can make use of every dollar of the appropriation, and much more.

I will give one illustration which came out in the hearings before the committee. The jobbers in Los Angeles, Calif., had been holding up the retail grocers—at least the retailers thought so—and they organized 600 strong and began to buy direct from the manufacturers. Then these jobbers got together and served notice on the manufacturers that if they sold direct to this cooperative organization they could not do any business through them, the jobbers. The manufacturers, therefore, refused to sell to the retail organization. This case was taken to the courts and the commission won. An appeal was taken and the higher court sustained the lower court, but the commission got in so late that the jobbers wrecked the cooperative buying organization. That is one of many cases.

There is a case now which is, to my mind, more important to the farmer than most if not all of the proposed legislation in his behalf; that is the matter known as the "Eastern Farm Machinery Dealers case." On February 6, 1924, the Federal Trade Commission issued a formal complaint against the International Harvester Co., Emerson Brantingham Co., the Moline Plow Co., Deere & Co., the Oliver Chilled Plow Works, and 500 other corporations, firms, associations, and individuals engaged in the farm machinery business. This complaint charges that these institutions and individuals have combined and conspired to fix and maintain retail prices of farm machinery at high levels, and are boycotting local dealers who refuse or neglect to maintain those price levels; and, also, it is charged, this combine refuses to sell any cooperative farmers' organization or to sell even to any person or dealer who is willing to sell farmer organizations machinery or even parts.

This, without question, is the most extensive antitrust suit ever instituted by any agency of the United States Government. Here are over 500 wealthy institutions and individuals charged as conspirators, able and willing to employ the best legal talent to be had, and all they need. It will be a hard fought and long drawn out proceeding. It will be necessary to have the best experts in different lines to assemble the evidence against this combine. There will be hundreds, if not thousands, of witnesses called for the Government from different sections of the country, whose expenses and per diem will have to be met. In this case alone the Federal Trade Commission has matched its meager means against millions upon millions of wealth, also its experts against the shrewdest business men of the country.

Counsel for the commission are preparing to go to trial in this case at the earliest possible date. As I stated a few moments ago, I think this is one of the most important matters, so far as the farmers are concerned, of anything now under consideration, not excepting the various farm relief measures. While the price of the farmers' produce has gone down and down, the price of his machinery has gone up. We have passed laws allowing the farmer to form cooperative organizations, but here is a combine which is intended to destroy his cooperative organizations. If the appropriation asked for in this bill should enable the Federal Trade Commission to carry this investigation to a successful conclusion, and do nothing else, it would be a good investment on the part of the Government. I know the farmers who are hard pressed are watching the outcome of this fight on the part of the commission with a great deal of interest and anxiety, and should it be heralded to the country that because Congress had been niggardly in its appropriation for this purpose it will cripple the commission and thus make it doubtful of success in this case, it will be a great disappointment to the farmers and farm organizations all over the Nation.

I want to call attention to another case now pending which is of vital interest to grain producers of the West and the Northwest. It is the case filed against the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and its board of directors and a publishing company, wherein it was charged that the chamber of commerce and the publishing company conspired to destroy the business of the Equity Cooperative Exchange, a competitor in the selling, buying, and distribution of grain, by the publication of false and misleading statements concerning the cooperative exchange, also its refusal to make available to the cooperative exchange and its members the telegraphic market quotation service, and boycotting the cooperative exchange by refusing to buy grain from it, and further suppressing competition among the members of the chamber of commerce, as well as nonmembers of it, by means of contracts blinding country shippers to ship all or a greater portion of their grain to the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. An order was made commanding the chamber of commerce to cease and desist from these unfair methods and practices December 28 last, and an

appeal has been taken to the circuit court of appeals. This matter has not been concluded, but will have to be fought to a conclusion in order for the Federal Trade Commission to save what it has already accomplished. I want to state here and now that the grain growers are vitally concerned about such matters, and are constantly looking to this commission to see that they get justice.

Only a few days ago the Governor of South Dakota appealed to the President to prevent the sudden increase in the price of gasoline. The President, desiring to comply with the request, took the only course he could, and that was to refer the matter to the Federal Trade Commission with directions to give it their prompt attention, which the commission has done and is doing to the best of its ability, handicapped as it is at the present time with an inadequate force. The Governor of South Dakota charges that the supply of crude oil has been cornered by companies subsidiaries of or belonging to the Standard Oil Co. Naturally these oil companies deny the charge—it could not be expected they would admit it—therefore it is up to the commission to investigate and find out whether or not the governor's charge is well founded. It should be borne in mind that in such investigations as this one, and as, for that matter, most all investigations, the commission can not send out two or three men and investigate one or two local concerns in ascertaining the facts as to whether or not there is a combine, or a corner, or a boycott, or unfair business methods being practiced. If it should proceed in that manner, nothing would be accomplished. It should be able to place competent men all over the country wherever the institution being investigated operates its business and at a given time or order all proceed at once in their investigations. If a local branch of an institution sought to be investigated is called on by a representative of the Federal Trade Commission and is aware of what is being done, such information naturally is at once conveyed to the entire system, and unless the entire system is covered by the investigators of the Federal Trade Commission its efforts would be useless.

Another very important matter that has been referred to this commission is what is known as the bread investigation. I can not conceive of a more important matter than this. Somebody or some class of individuals or institutions are literally robbing poor, helpless people of the absolute necessity of life, and that is bread. When I say robbing, the price is being kept up so as to make it impossible for the poorer classes of people to provide themselves with a sufficient amount. Statistics can be had to show there are thousands of families in congested districts, I am told, that are undernourished because of the high costs of the absolute necessities of life, such as bread.

This condition is prevailing in the United States where there is plenty for all. Only a few days ago this Congress voted \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to help provide food for starving women and children of Germany, and a similar condition exists there as we have here. That is to say, reliable statistics show there is an abundant food supply in Germany, and the trouble is it is not evenly distributed. They have there the unconscionable profiteer, and a class that is rolling in luxury while the poorer people are starving, and for that relief Congress very generously voted \$10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, which will amount to only a drop in the bucket so far as relief is concerned. I understand there are in the Department of Commerce here in Washington reports showing there were 41,464,135 metric tons of breadstuffs and potatoes harvested in Germany last autumn. This means that for the entire year there is more than 3½ pounds of this kind of food daily for every man, woman, and child in Germany. This same authority shows the supply of fats is satisfactory. Even the city shops are fairly bursting with food, but notwithstanding all this about one-fourth of the population of Germany is undernourished. That condition to a remarkable degree exists here in the United States to-day, but instead of voting \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury we are endeavoring to get an appropriation of a few thousand dollars to prevent the profiteers or human hogs from robbing the people who must have it or be undernourished, as in Germany.

Since the expiration of the war-time control of wheat in June, 1920, it has declined in price from about \$2.95 per bushel in Chicago to about \$1.20 in December, 1923, or about 60 per cent, while during the same period bread in New York City, for instance, has declined from 11.1 cents per pound loaf in June, 1920, to 9 cents per pound loaf in December, 1923, or about 19 per cent. It is these conditions the Federal Trade Commission is called upon to investigate. Who will say the wheat producer does not want to know or has not a right to know why with such high bread prices he gets such low prices for his wheat, or will say that the consumer should not know

why with such low prices for wheat he is compelled to pay so much for bread? It seems to be an easy matter to get an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to relieve the suffering in Germany caused by profiteers, but when it comes to getting a few thousand dollars appropriated to enable a Government agency to investigate the same kind of profiteers in this country and prevent a like condition being brought about it is a different proposition.

At this time the Federal Trade Commission is investigating why the continued high cost of furniture for furnishing the home. Statistics show there have been extensive declines in the prices of many of the raw materials of furniture manufacturers; but notwithstanding that fact, the high price of furniture—war prices, if you please—still stay with us, and this is especially true of the most necessary articles of furniture. The inquiry on the part of the Federal Trade Commission has already resulted in a report on domestic furniture which clearly shows one highly objectionable influence operating to keep up prices, and that is throughout the country various trade organizations have been deliberately promoting conspiracies on the part of their members to put up the prices of the furniture they make or deal in. This much has been accomplished up to date, but it is only a beginning, and to make the investigation effective it will be necessary to continue the inquiry and extend it to all other important lines of the furniture business. This can not be done, however, without sufficient funds with which to carry on the investigation to completion.

One of the most important investigations now being carried on by the commission is the "radio industry." The partial investigation made by the Federal Trade Commission has shown that unless some steps are taken by the Government to stop a gigantic combination or trust from being perfected, if it has not already been done, the radio business will soon be absolutely controlled and exclusively manipulated by a few members of the combine. When this occurs that part of the business world not in the combine is at the mercy of the trust. This investigation was called for by this House in a resolution—No. 548—passed just at the close of the Sixty-seventh Congress at the suggestion of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

There is a complaint before the commission at this time charging that the General Electric Co. and others had set up the Radio Corporation as a bogus independent, and by the use of tying contracts and price discrimination in the sale of its products was attempting to acquire a monopoly in the manufacture and sale of radio apparatus. The commission started on its investigation and on December 1, 1923, made its report, which consists of 346 pages, and some startling facts are set forth in that report.

It is shown there were contracts entered into between the General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Western Electric Co. (Inc.), American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Wireless Specialty Co., United Fruit Co., and the Radio Corporation of America as to the interchange of patents, licenses, and so forth. This much has been ascertained by the commission. If the Members of Congress have not read that report, I suggest that they do so, and without doubt you will have no trouble in reaching a conclusion that the commission should pursue the investigation further and be furnished the means to do so.

I could mention many other matters pending before the commission at this time, some of them just as important as the few I have mentioned, and I expect to do this some time in the near future, when I shall ask for the passage of a measure to give the commission some power and authority to make examinations, for I admit the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of the Federal Trade Commission against the American Tobacco Co., handed down the 17th of this month, practically paralyzes the commission, if it does not destroy its usefulness; and for one I am in favor, at an early date, of passing a measure that will restore it not only to its former status but give it even greater powers than it ever possessed.

There has not been adequate provision made for this agency since the war. While it voluntarily reduced its force of employees from 640 to 367 soon after the signing of the armistice, there has been no let-up in the regular business that comes to it from the business world, to say nothing of the demands of Congress. With the appropriation made last year it was necessary to discontinue travel for the purpose of investigation in many very important matters. Being compelled to call these men in from the field of investigation has been a serious matter. Many inquiries have come in from business men which should have received immediate attention, but because of the lack of funds can not be investigated, and a further decrease in the appropriation will mean to stop practically all activity.

If Congress is satisfied for this commission to merely do nothing but draw salaries, then there is no need of this appropriation. While Congress might be satisfied for this to occur, there is one thing to a certainty—the people who are depending on the activities of this commission will not be satisfied.

I could produce a thousand resolutions in commendation of the Federal Trade Commission for its wonderful work, and these resolutions are from all classes of people, like the American Livestock Association, the National Board of Farm Organizations, creamery associations, dairy associations, the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, the typographical unions, the National League of Women Voters, all of the farm and labor organizations, and practically all of the leading newspapers of the country, showing the respect and feeling the people have for this commission.

An examination of the amount of unfinished work on hand at this time and more continually coming in from those who have a right to have their complaints heard and immediately investigated, to say nothing of the demands made by Congress and the President, would convince any fair-minded man that, to do justice to the people who are depending on the commission and as well do justice also to the commission itself, there should be a material increase in the personnel of the legal division, even to the extent of double what it is at the present, and also the same as to the economic staff. I am heartily in favor of making a decided increase in the personnel of all the departments of the Federal Trade Commission and to pass the necessary legislation at an early date to make it a useful and powerful governmental agency.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record at this time in saying that instead of decreasing the appropriation, as is proposed in this bill, I am in favor of increasing it and making the appropriation more than it is for the current year. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

[Mr. HASTINGS was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the ex-service men should understand the parliamentary trickery used in the consideration of the adjusted compensation bill.

The Ways and Means Committee had been considering the question of all kinds of options for more than 10 days. On Friday, March 14, before any bill was reported or made public, notice was given that it was to come up for action in the House on Tuesday, March 18, 1924. A confidential committee print was released and made public Saturday noon, March 15, 1924. It provided for payment, in cash, of adjusted service where the amount does not exceed \$50, and for paid-up insurance for all where the amount is in excess of that amount. There were no other options. The amount of \$1.25 per day is allowed for overseas service and \$1 per day for home service. I favored an adjusted compensation payable in cash, filed a statement with the committee to that effect on March 10, and made a speech in the House March 14 to that effect. The Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 13 Republicans to 12—11 Democrats and 1 Republican—voted to exclude the cash option on amounts of more than \$50. The bill was brought up on "suspension day," when a motion to suspend the rules of the House is in order. The precise motion made was to suspend the rules and to pass the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee. No amendment was in order and none could be offered. The bill contained 26 printed pages, affects 4,650,500 ex-service men—of this number 248,170 were either killed or wounded—and involves, it is estimated, an aggregate cost of \$2,091,007,938. Yet under political trickery no amendment was in order and a Member of the House had to vote directly for the bill as a whole or against it; either to suspend the rules and pass the bill, or against the suspension of the rules and defeat the bill.

Under the circumstances I voted for the bill for the following reasons:

First. A vote against the bill would have defeated its consideration at this session of Congress.

Second. The bill now goes to the Senate, where an opportunity can be had to debate and amend it, and where it is expected a cash option will be included, and when it is returned to the House a direct vote can be forced upon the Senate amendments. I am determined that the ex-service men of my district and State shall know the parliamentary and political trickery used in the consideration of this bill to keep it from being debated and to keep amendments favorable to the ex-service men and other options from being offered for adoption. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNES].



[Mr. BURTNESS was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, before proceeding to discuss the agricultural situation and certain proposed agricultural relief measures I want to say that I was greatly impressed with the remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] a few minutes ago relating to the necessity for providing proper appropriations for the work of the Federal Trade Commission. Some of the work which is now being done by the Federal Trade Commission is of intense importance to this country, particularly such investigations as the bread investigation, the investigation into the production, distribution, and cost of gasoline, and the investigations involving the case which relates to alleged unfair practices on the grain exchanges.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that the Sixty-seventh Congress passed more remedial legislation intended for the direct benefit of agriculture than has ever been passed in the history of our country, we find agriculture in many sections in a deplorable condition.

It is not my purpose to review the record of the Sixty-seventh Congress on agricultural legislation but will simply mention the most important of such laws passed by Congress, most of them with the support of the Members of both parties and signed by President Harding. I recall at this time the emergency tariff act, the act reviving the War Finance Corporation and providing for agricultural loans, the act regulating the packers and stockyards industry, the law regulating trading in futures upon our grain exchanges, laws liberalizing the farm loan act with reference to maximum loans, as well as providing an additional \$25,000,000 by way of a revolving fund, the law providing for direct agricultural representation upon the Federal Reserve Board, the filled milk act, the intermediate credit act, and last, but not least, the law affirmatively legalizing cooperative marketing associations and exempting them from the provisions of the antitrust laws.

At the opening of this Congress President Coolidge devoted a substantial portion of his message to agricultural problems. I quote the following therefrom:

Aided by the sound principles adopted by the Government, the business of the country has had an extraordinary revival. Looked at as a whole, the Nation is in the enjoyment of remarkable prosperity. Industry and commerce are thriving. For the most part agriculture is successful, 11 staples having risen in value from about \$5,800,000,000 two years ago to about \$7,000,000,000 for the current year. But range cattle are still low in price, and some sections of the wheat area, notably Minnesota, North Dakota, and on west, have many cases of actual distress. With his products not selling on a parity with the products of industry, every sound remedy that can be devised should be applied for the relief of the farmer. He represents a character, a type of citizenship, and a public necessity that must be preserved and afforded every facility for regaining prosperity.

On January 23 President Coolidge transmitted a special message to Congress containing special recommendations for legislation for the relief of distress in the wheat areas of the Northwest. Permit me to quote therefrom as follows:

The economic situation in certain wheat-growing sections of the Northwest is reaching an acute stage, which requires organized cooperation on the part of the Federal Government and the local institutions of that territory for its solution. In my message of December 6, 1923, I stated:

"The distress is most acute among those wholly dependent upon one crop. Wheat acreage was greatly expanded and has not yet been sufficiently reduced. A large amount is raised for export, which has to meet the competition in the world market of large amounts raised on land much cheaper and much more productive. Diversification is necessary. Those farmers who raise their living on their land are not greatly in distress. Such loans as are widely needed to assist buying stock and other materials to start in this direction should be financed through a Government agency as a temporary and emergency expedient."

Great numbers of individual farmers are so involved in debt, both on mortgages and to merchants and banks, that they are unable to preserve the equity of their properties. They are unable to undertake the diversification of farming that is fundamentally necessary for sound agricultural reconstruction of the area. They are unable to meet their obligations, and thereby has been involved the entire mercantile and banking fabric of these regions. Not only have there been large numbers of foreclosures on actual farms but there are great numbers of farmers who are continuing in possession on sufferance from their creditors. There have been large and increasing bank failures. Bills have been introduced providing for the lending by the Federal Govern-

ment of moneys directly to the farmers for purposes of assisting them in conversion of their farms on the basis of diversified farming. I am heartily in favor of these bills, but they do not and will not compass the entire problem.

In this same message the President recommended that Congress extend the time until December 31, 1924, during which the War Finance Corporation may make loans for the benefit of agriculture. This particular recommendation was heeded by Congress and the necessary law was promptly passed.

In his message of January 23 the President also announced his intention of calling together the large business concerns interested in the country as a whole with a view of enlisting their help in a private movement to help out not only the banks which were falling fast but also to refund the past-due indebtedness of the farmer at lower rates of interest and on terms under which the farmer would have a reasonable opportunity to work out his salvation. Such a conference was later called. It was presided over by Secretary Hoover. Out of that conference resulted the Agricultural Credit Corporation, with a capital of \$1,000,000 fully subscribed by the business interests of the country. Through the War Finance Corporation this Agricultural Credit Corporation can command ten times its capital, or \$10,000,000, for the purposes intended. It has set to work and great hopes are entertained as to the good it may accomplish. It is too early to judge as to what the actual results may be. They now depend largely upon the skill, ability, understanding, and vision of the men in charge. The good faith of the President and his advisers in the matter can not be questioned. Already considerable has been done in the way of reestablishing confidence in our business institutions.

I regret, however, that Congress has failed to enact the specific bill recommended by the President and known as the Norbeck-Burtness bill. It has been defeated in the Senate by a vote of 41 to 32, 20 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and 2 Farmer-Laborites voting for it and 18 Republicans and 23 Democrats voting against it. Perhaps the bill was too sectional in its nature. It was not intended as general relief legislation, and was simply intended to accelerate diversification in the wheat areas by providing loans at a time when credit facilities are not otherwise obtainable.

In the wheat areas we claim that we are in all justice entitled to a little special consideration. Our case is stronger than that of any other section of the country. By the enactment of legislation in 1917 our Government reduced in value by the stroke of the pen every bushel of our wheat to the extent of almost \$1 per bushel. We constituted the one industry which remained in private hands which was not allowed war profits.

In fact, the bulk-line production of wheat was sold even during the war in the spring-wheat States at a set price less than the cost of production. But that was not all. We had come to realize shortly before the war that we could not continue to raise one crop year after year. The weed problem, the partial exhaustion of the fertility of our soil, the diseases to soil and grain had convinced most of us that we must diversify our crops. We had made a fair start toward the raising of corn, alfalfa, cattle, and hogs. The demand of the Nation and our allies was for bread bullets as well as for lead bullets. We were urged to sell our cattle and our sheep, to plow up our pastures, and plant every available acre to wheat. The person who did not comply was regarded as unpatriotic. The war campaign for more wheat set us back in our program of diversification, not 2 or 3 or 5 years but at least 10 or 12 years. Our soil became further depleted, more wheat sick and diseased, necessarily resulting in poor yields, and the wheat crop every year, with one exception, since 1915 sold at less than the cost of production. Is that all? Scarcely. There is no way of estimating with a fair degree of certainty the exact amount lost by the wheat farmers of the country due to governmental handling during the war. We do know, however, that the United States Grain Corporation made considerable profits in handling the wheat, and that our Government did not do as the Government of Canada did, prorate such profits back to the wheat growers. As I told you during the discussion of the resolution for the relief of the starving women and children of Germany, Congress, on March 30, 1920, provided for the sale of 5,000,000 barrels of flour to relieve populations in the countries of Europe suffering for lack of food, and the act gave permission to the corporation to take securities in exchange for such flour. Securities amounting to \$56,858,802.49 were accepted from the nondescript countries of central Europe, and not a dollar of those securities have been paid. That flour equitably belonged to the wheat farmers of the Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman said a moment ago that it was difficult to estimate the amount that the farmers lost. Is it not a fact that an estimate was made that it was well beyond a billion dollars?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; that estimate is doubtless conservative. Other estimates have been made of two or three times that sum. I meant no one can tell to a certainty. Again, in December, 1921, Congress desired to be liberal to the starving peoples of Europe. In glancing about for some money to give away, Congress found that the United States Grain Corporation still had on hand approximately \$20,000,000 in profits realized upon the sale of wheat; and so we gave that money away to Russia. In spite of the fact that under these two acts alone contributions totaling practically \$77,000,000 out of funds equitably belonging to the wheat farmers have been made to Europe, Congress at this session has refused to loan \$50,000,000 to the stricken wheat areas upon fair security, even though the President earnestly recommended the enactment of such legislation.

As Representatives from the wheat area, therefore, we are not further looking for legislation for our special benefit, but we are intensely interested in any legislation that would be for the benefit of agriculture in general. We realize also that the only legislation which can be of permanent value is legislation the enactment of which would tend to give us better prices for farm products, prices fairly comparable to the cost of commodities we must buy. Incidentally, I might say that in spite of the refusal of Congress to come to our help in changing our farming methods, the spring-wheat areas are going to diversify. The process will be slow and tedious and beset with difficulties, but in 10 years from now I firmly believe that the Red River Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota, so long known as the "bread basket of the world," as well as the rest of North Dakota and portions of Montana, will become as famous for its alfalfa, its corn, its livestock, and its dairy products as it once was for its No. 1 hard wheat.

But how can agricultural prices be improved by legislation? Several bills with that general purpose in view are pending, but the one in which the country has become more interested than in any other during the past few months is the so-called McNary-Haugen bill. Every Member of Congress has received communications favoring as well as opposing it.

My speaking on the bill to-day is in the hope that, without being technical, I may fairly set out what the bill will do and on what principles it is founded. The average person is not interested in details as to the machinery provided, but is and should be interested in the results accomplished. It is early enough to discuss the detailed machinery when the bill reaches the floor of the House, as I hope it will soon.

The McNary-Haugen bill provides for machinery, including an agricultural export commission and an agricultural export corporation, which may deal in certain specific farm crops and the products therefrom whenever it is necessary to do so in order to maintain fair, legitimate prices thereon.

Its proponents have two principal purposes in view: First, that of providing a price for such farm products on a parity with the cost of commodities which enter into the farmer's cost of living and his cost of production; secondly, to provide means to give crops of which we have an exportable surplus the same protection from the tariff as is given to crops like flax and wool, or given generally to the products of eastern factories, where the difficulties of an exportable surplus are not encountered.

Everyone will, of course, agree that the important factor in prices for farm products is not the exact number of dollars and cents that a person gets for a load of wheat, or corn, or hogs, or cattle, but, rather, how much a farmer can with the proceeds thereof purchase in food, fuel, and clothing for his family, and in machinery, equipment, labor, and all other commodities or services which enter into the cost of producing his grain, livestock, or other farm products. There is no guesswork as to whether farm prices have recently been fair or not, for that question can be determined with mathematical certainty due to the fact that the Government Bureau of Labor Statistics has for several decades kept a very complete and satisfactory record indicating the general cost of living.

The proponents of the McNary-Haugen bill have taken a 10-year period, from 1905 to 1914, inclusive, as a period which represents fairly normal conditions throughout the United States. No one will claim that the farming industry in the country as a whole was unduly prosperous during such period. The general relationship of farming to other lines of business was probably as nearly normal as at any time in the history of our country. Some farmers made money, others went broke, but the average thrifty and competent farmer was able

to earn a living for himself and his family and secure a small return upon his invested capital. The market price of commodities selected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and properly weighted in accordance with their importance and use, during such period can therefore be accepted as a normal basis upon which to make a beginning. In other words, we can call that base 100. The question then arises as to what the market price for such commodities are now. The Bureau of Labor Statistics finds as a matter of mathematical certainty that the index of all such commodities for the year 1923 was 162.3. In other words, the general cost of commodities in 1923 was 62.3 per cent greater than in the 10-year period from 1905 to 1914. The important question, therefore, is whether in 1923 farm products maintained the same relative ratio. Unfortunately, most of them did not. To illustrate: The average grade of wheat should, during 1923, have sold for 46 cents more per bushel than it did in order to have maintained the proper ratio with the cost of other commodities. Corn should have sold for about 15 cents more per bushel than it did. Cattle should have sold for \$1.17 more per 100 pounds. Hogs should have sold for \$3.43 more per 100 pounds. Some farm products, like wool and cotton, sold at a price greater in exchange value than such commodities brought during the 10-year period. Everyone will concede the fairness, as well as the advisability, of maintaining such a fair ratio price for all staple farm products if reasonably possible to do so, and, as above indicated, that is the purpose of the McNary-Haugen measure.

On investigation it is found as a general proposition that crops which do not bring a fair relative price at this time are usually those of which the United States produces an exportable surplus. That is only natural, due to general conditions in Europe. The one outstanding exception to this rule is cotton, and the present high price of cotton is due almost wholly to the ravages of the boll weevil, which has so greatly reduced the available supply. Everyone concedes that it is difficult to get the full benefit of the tariff, or much appreciable benefit from the tariff, on crops or commodities of which we have an exportable surplus. The intent to give such products the same benefit of the tariff as other commodities get must also be conceded to be fair in principle. The interests of other lines of business or of consumers generally are not prejudiced thereby.

Now, then, how do the proponents of the McNary-Haugen bill expect to accomplish these two purposes? Let me put the matter very plainly by suggesting this question, and for convenience sake I will make the question apply to wheat: If one man—or one corporation or one cooperative association of producers—controlled the entire wheat crop of the country and realized that at least three-fourths thereof could be sold in the markets for local consumption and that about one-fourth would have to be sold abroad, what would he do? Would he sell the entire crop at the price of the world market? Would he not rather do what any well-regulated business does when it produces a surplus—sell such surplus at what it can get in the world's markets but so handle the matter as to receive the benefit of the import duty and thereby a reasonable price on the main portion? If the exportable surplus of wheat is segregated and sold in the world's markets, the balance could be sold locally for a price exceeding the world price by the amount of the tariff and the cost of transportation from foreign countries into our markets. The wheat industry, existing as it does over a large extent of territory, is not now organized, and can not be within a reasonable time, in such a way that the growers themselves can handle the matter as suggested.

Stripped of its seeming technicalities, the bill simply provides the machinery whereby the exportable surplus of such a crop as wheat can be segregated and sold in the world markets and the balance of the crop sold locally for a ratio price which is equal in exchange value to the price obtained for the crop during the 10-year period hereinbefore referred to. The export corporation must stand ready to buy the wheat offered at such ratio price, and that in itself will determine the minimum price within the United States. All of the producers of wheat will, however, pay their pro rata share of the loss upon the exportable surplus. That share is estimated in advance upon available information as to the amount of crop, the amount that must be sold abroad, and so forth, and a sufficient amount is in reality taxed against the producer when he sells such wheat by giving him the estimated tax or equalization fee in the form of "scrip." The export corporation gets the proceeds from the sale of the scrip by the Government in cash.

The opponents of the measure have attempted to prejudice the minds of the people against the bill because of the proposed use of such scrip, intimating that no one will know what the



value thereof will be, and that it may become a vehicle for improper speculation. Of course, if the equalization fee could be determined with exactness in advance such scrip would be valueless, for no greater equalization fee should be assessed than sufficient to take care of the loss on the exportable surplus and the cost of operation. To prevent loss, however, to the taxpayers—that is, to the United States Treasury—naturally, the body determining the amount to be paid for in scrip must be conservative and will probably place that amount at a little higher figure than what may be sufficient to take care of the loss on the surplus and the expenses of operation. At the end of the year, when such loss and expenses have been ascertained, the balance on hand may be distributed pro rata to the holders of the scrip. In all probability the amount of the scrip in the case of wheat would not exceed 15 cents per bushel.

In other words, the difference between the present market price of wheat and the ratio price, based on the pre-war 10-year average, is approximately 50 cents per bushel. Producers can, under the plan proposed by the McNary-Haugen bill, get such additional 50 cents per bushel, providing they pay, so to speak, an assessment of approximately 15 cents per bushel on their entire production. Therefore, the question is simply whether a farmer prefers to get about \$1 per bushel for his wheat as at the present time or whether he would prefer to receive \$1.35 per bushel in cash for such wheat and receive further scrip representing a 15-cent assessment, which scrip may or may not become of any value. In all likelihood its value would be rather nominal. Of course, there is no doubt as to the reply of the farmer if this feature is plainly explained to him.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will.

Mr. TINCHER. If they are afraid of the scrip, why not try the principle for one year with the profit that the War Finance Corporation and the United States Grain Corporation made off the fund?

Mr. BURTNESS. That may be a good suggestion. One reason why I emphasize the amount of the profits of the Grain Corporation is to indicate the fairness of using such profits for a purpose such as this.

Mr. TINCHER. If that does hold the domestic consumption up to the ratio, the farmers would not kick on the scrip.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will.

Mr. ROACH. How are you going to build up an organization such as is provided for in the McNary-Haugen bill with the expectation that it would only function for one year? It is physically impossible for such an organization to be created for so short a time.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am not in favor of building it up for one year. I understand the House committee has agreed on five years, or at any rate that period has been suggested in the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. I understood the gentleman from Louisiana would yield me some time.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Louisiana is out. I have charge of the time. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. BURTNESS. I notice that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] in a letter to the Illinois Agricultural Association attacks the bill, at least by inference, because it proposes to provide for the cost of operation and the loss from the exportable surplus by the so-called scrip. He assumes that this scrip will operate to bring about a period of expansion in our currency. In other words, he presumes that it will in effect be money, for he talks about increasing the circulating medium without increasing our gold base, and so forth. Of course the answer to that contention is that the scrip is not a circulating medium in any sense of the term. The use of that word in designating the paper that will be given the farmer is perhaps unfortunate, for, as a matter of fact, the scrip amounts to nothing more or less than a receipt for the assessment that it is necessary to make upon the entire crop to take care of the cost and loss referred to. It is identical in principle to the interest retained by any person who pools his wool, his wheat, his tobacco, or his cotton with some cooperative association, receiving an advance covering perhaps the greater portion of the purchase price, but who must await the final sale of all of the pooled crop or produce, as well as the determination of the cost of operation, before he can receive the balance of the purchase price. It is not dissimilar in operation to the arrangement made by most beet-sugar factories with the growers of beets and who guarantee such growers a minimum amount for the beets, but provide for a further payment for such beets, the exact amount of which depends upon a number of contingencies,

including the wholesale price of sugar during the manufacturing season.

A very fair argument has been raised against the bill by the grain trade to the effect that the enactment of the measure will eliminate trading in futures on the grain exchanges, and will therefore make it impossible for a concern like a farmers' elevator to protect itself against a fall in the monthly ratio price by legitimate hedging. It is by no means certain that trading in futures will be eliminated, and it is quite possible, and probably likely, that such trading will continue on a basis above the ratio price. If that is so the farmers' elevators and like concerns will have the same protection in so far as hedging is concerned that they now have.

Assuming, however, that the argument of the grain trade is correct and that future trading would be stopped, then what is the result? I have strongly urged the proponents of the measure that they eliminate determining the ratio price upon the figures given for each month during the pre-war period and establish the ratio price simply upon the average weighted price which existed throughout the entire 10-year period without regard to what such price may have been in the arbitrary divisions of calendar months. I feel certain that the bill will be amended in that regard. What will that mean? The answer is plain. Practically a stable ratio price throughout the entire marketing season, thus eliminating any necessity for hedging and making it possible for farmers' elevators or other grain-buying concerns to buy their grain on a lower rather than a higher margin. In any event with such change the price could not vary from month to month unless the price of all commodities should vary, and past experience tells us that such variations are not likely to exceed more than 1 per cent. I think every person concedes that it is now impossible for an elevator company to so handle its hedging operations as to give perfect protection. No buyer knows during the business hours of the day during the marketing season whether outstanding storage tickets amounting to 500 or 5,000 bushels are likely to be surrendered and sold before night. Hedging must now of necessity be based in part upon estimates as to the business that may be conducted on any given day or before the market again changes, and we all know the large fluctuations that may occur. Hedging now can only be done in 1,000-bushel lots. Assuming therefore the adoption of the McNary-Haugen measure, with the amendment suggested, I am convinced that the need for any hedge would be eliminated unless trading should occur on the market above the ratio price level, in which event the same protection would be afforded as at the present time.

There is some merit to the objection by the organized grain trade that the plan will result in increasing the production of such a crop as wheat. When they make that criticism they admit that the price of wheat will be increased to the producer. The danger of overproduction, however, should not be great where all that is accomplished is to place the value of wheat on the same relative basis as it was from the years 1905 to 1914. Such prices must be generally maintained unless American agriculture is to perish. The additional difficulties in raising wheat now, as compared with that period, due to foul weeds, exhaustion of soil fertility, and so forth, must be recognized by every intelligent farmer, and ought not to tend to encourage production above what it was during normal times, but should on the other hand tend to keep the production at a lower figure. Another factor in that regard, however, is of great importance, and that is the fact that this bill can be applied to other farm products mentioned in it, and that the tendency will be to raise simultaneously such other farm products, maintaining all of them in the same relative position. In other words, there will be no specific inducement to change the relationship of acreage sown in so far as ratio prices are concerned.

But let us assume for the sake of the argument that the result would be an enormous increase in wheat acreage. Production in recent years in round figures has been about 800,000,000 bushels. Domestic consumption amounts to approximately 600,000,000 bushels. How much can such production be increased? During the war when every effort was made to increase wheat production throughout the United States, and when the farmers responded patriotically in most cases, and almost under the lash of the Government in others, the wheat crop of the country amounted to considerably less than 1,000,000,000 bushels. In 1917 the crop was, in round figures, 636,000,000 bushels; in 1918 it was 921,000,000 bushels; in 1919 it was 967,000,000 bushels; and in 1920 it fell to 833,000,000 bushels. It is inconceivable that our wheat acreage would again be raised to the point that it was during the war, but assuming that it should be, what would be the actual result in the operation of the proposed law? It would simply require

an increase in the equalization fee from the estimated 15 cents per bushel to approximately 20 cents per bushel, thus reducing the net return to the farmer from about \$1.35 per bushel to \$1.30. In other words, a 20-cent equalization fee on 950,000,000 bushels would amount to \$190,000,000, and would more than pay a 50-cent loss on an exportable surplus of 350,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has addressed himself entirely to wheat. Does not the bill go much further and deal with other crops more perishable?

Mr. BURTNESS. I have used wheat in my argument for illustration purposes. It applies with equal force to other staple crops and would operate as well on most crops, although I concede that as to cattle and beef it would be more difficult, on account of the difficulty of establishing standard grades.

Mr. TILSON. Wheat and cotton are two commodities almost imperishable, or at least they keep for a long time, and the conditions that might apply to them would not apply to other crops which are perishable.

Mr. BURTNESS. Beef under present cold-storage facilities is not very perishable.

I also doubt whether there is any merit to the objections raised by some in the spring-wheat States that the passage of the act would tend to eliminate or reduce the premium paid for spring wheat above the prices paid for the winter wheats. Why is there a difference in the price at the present time? The answer is plain. The hard spring wheat is worth more to the millers. The passage of legislation can not change the relative inherent value of one wheat over another. If millers are compelled to pay the ratio price upon the winter wheats in order to get it, they will, of course, pay that much more in order to get the hard spring wheat, and the amount paid in addition will be determined by the actual desirability of the wheat. Furthermore, this objection is predicated upon the assumption that the ratio price would be established for all classes of wheat. That is not true. The ratio price would be established for the various varieties of wheat and be based upon the relative values of such various varieties as indicated by actual prices at terminal markets during the 10-year period taken as a basis. If the difference thus established in the ratio price itself is not sufficient to cover the actual difference in relative values between wheats under present milling conditions, there seems no good reason why such additional advantage, if any, will not be further reflected in the price. In other words, if a definite ratio price is established and maintained on the poorest quality of wheat, will not better qualities of necessity demand a premium commensurate with their additional values on the open market?

To those who argue that it would be better for the Government to simply fix a price and to buy all the wheat at such price and then let the United States Treasury stand whatever loss may be incurred on the sale of the exportable surplus I need simply state that there is not the least chance of that sort of legislation being enacted by Congress. Members representing districts not primarily engaged in raising wheat will not approve such a law. Responsible leaders of the administration will not subject the Treasury to such unlimited risks. The large majority of Congress properly hesitate and refuse to establish that sort of a precedent. The appeal which the McNary-Haugen bill should have to Members of Congress from districts not selling farm crops is the fact that no drain on the Treasury is demanded, except some working capital; that no loss on the exported surplus will be borne by the taxpayers but by those engaged in the business itself; and that no attempt is made to procure an unduly large price, but one simply sufficient to put us back on a relatively normal pre-war basis. Senator Gooding, who introduced a \$1.75 price guaranty bill for wheat, has abandoned such bill because he believes that the McNary-Haugen bill is much the better and sounder measure.

Critics may charge that the McNary-Haugen bill is paternalistic, communistic, socialistic, and what not; but, after all, in its final analysis it simply establishes the governmental agencies which make it possible for the agricultural producers under postwar conditions to market their crops in the same way that a well-organized corporation, like the International Harvester Co. of America, can do, and that is to prevent the price that has to be accepted from the war-ridden countries of Europe for surplus production to largely control the price charged within the United States.

Not only does the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the Farmers' Union heartily indorse this bill but it has also been indorsed by some of the best econo-

mists, some of the shrewdest business men, and some of the most capable bankers in the United States. True, it is quite generally opposed by the organized grain trade and the milling industry and by the Wall Street Journal. It seems significant, however, that an excellent business man like Mr. George N. Peek, president of the New Moline Plow Co., whose business is directly dependent upon the prosperity of the farmers, has spent so much time and money and effort in behalf of this measure. Surely no one is disposed to call Mr. Peek a communist or a Bolshevik. Can not the same be said about such men as John R. Mitchell, president of the Capital National Bank, of St. Paul; Mr. Noyes, of Noyes Bros. & Cutler; Louis Hill, president of the Great Northern Railroad; and others, who could be named as supporters? Even the well-known conservative banker Otto Kahn is favorable to the principles underlying the measure.

To be in a position to maintain the ratio price, authority is granted in the law to increase the tariff so as to prevent shipments from Canada or any other country. That plainly is a necessary power in order to make the legislation effective. Incidentally such power will also assure the saving of the American market to American producers alone.

Personally, I think the bill can be further perfected and amended. I should recommend simplification by eliminating the so-called export commission and giving its powers to the directors of the export corporation. I would be inclined not to allow the minimum ratio price when once established to be changed at all during a given marketing season, but to provide in the case of wheat for an increase in such ratio price by the addition of a small carrying charge from month to month not to exceed 1 cent per bushel. Such matters, however, are details which will be considered and carefully perfected before the bill can be finally enacted into law. The persons criticizing the measure are rendering excellent service, for they point out possible defects which should, and I believe can, be eliminated.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The purpose is to help the farmer, I presume.

Mr. BURTNESS. I would not be speaking here to-day unless I thought it would help the farmer.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman remember the speech of the gentleman from New York, Bourke Cockran, in which he said that he represented 5,000,000 consumers in New York and he was going to put us on notice that those 5,000,000 consumers wanted everything they ate and everything they wore just as cheap as they could get it? Now, you are going to have to contend with that side of it when you pass a bill of this kind.

Mr. BURTNESS. I realize that; but I am also pleased to find that the representatives of the American Federation of Labor have stated before the Agriculture Committee that they are willing that legislation with this purpose should be passed, and they are willing to pay fair prices for these farm products. Of course they know and realize, if they give the matter any thought, that they can not continue to be employed at high wages in the manufacture of shoes, clothing, farm machinery, lumber, woolen goods, automobiles, or anything else unless the purchasing power of the farmers of this country can be maintained.

The spring-wheat States of the Northwest have contributed to the plan embodied in the bill. The resolutions passed last summer at meetings in Fargo and Minot, N. Dak., in Wheaton, Minn., and elsewhere were based upon identical principles, but did not set out in detail the machinery for which provision is made in the bill. The committee appointed by the meeting of the bankers of the ninth Federal reserve district, held at Fargo, N. Dak., about September 1 last, and which came on to Washington and interviewed the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other administration leaders, carried the movement forward to a very considerable extent.

In conclusion let me say that the bill embodies a crystallization of the best thought of literally hundreds of people who have given the solution of the difficulties confronting us in the present agricultural emergency very thorough study. Let us as Members of Congress earnestly set to work to perfect it, if need be, and then pass it for the preservation of agriculture and for the best interests of commerce and all other industry as well. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, on March 18 I submitted to the House from the Committee on the Judiciary House bill 7190, to amend the China trade act, 1922, approved September 19, 1922, together with a report, No. 321. I trust that this legis-



lation will receive the early and favorable consideration of the House. It is badly needed to enable the China trade act of the Sixty-seventh Congress to properly function as contemplated by the House when it passed the House bill 4810 of that Congress. Amendments and changes made in this legislation in the Senate of the last Congress, and which make it unworkable as originally contemplated, necessitate the amendments to the law heretofore referred to. If the law is amended as recommended, it will have the effect of putting American interests doing business in China on an equality with other nations. It also will have the effect of inducing Chinese capital to participate with American capital in undertakings in China to encourage American trade there. It will also provide a uniform and practical manner for creating corporations under a Federal law to do business in China. I trust that the Members of the House will study the bill and the report referred to, so that all may see our responsibility and duty in the premises.

The great nations of the world are strongly contending for the trade of China. The world's commerce of the future is in the Pacific, with China as the principal goal. Many splendid Americans, representing American trade and business, are in China to develop American trade there. They have to contend against heavy odds, due to favored laws that other nationals enjoy. This legislation is an effort to give to Americans an "equal opportunity" for trade in China. We seek no advantage for our citizens, but simply an equal chance.

Some Americans in their efforts to establish trade in China and the Pacific have succeeded against the adverse conditions, but many have failed. The hazards have been too great. The United States needs now, and more for the future, an increase in foreign trade. The only field of consequence is in the Pacific. China is a vast country with immense resources and occupies a stretch of territory one-sixth larger than continental United States. Her population is four times as large as our population and her climatic conditions and natural resources are quite similar to ours. For years through the work of our missionaries and educators and the operation of our "open-door" policy we have been building up a great asset of good will toward America on the part of the Chinese people. They know that America has no designs on their territory and that the close commercial relations of the two Republics will do much to strengthen China and enable her to more successfully cope with aggressors who do have designs upon her territory. The recent revival of American trade with China may mislead some to think commercial relations with that country are of short standing. Such a supposition is not borne out by history. One hundred and thirty-six years ago an American ship visited Canton, China, with such good results that a regular trade followed. American clipper ships were an important factor in the commerce of China from the visit of that first vessel in 1778 to 1860, when our commerce was driven from the seas by the development of the British merchant marine. During the height of the period, along about 1825, American shipping and trade led in the Far East.

In 1805, 37 American ships carried nearly \$6,000,000 worth of American merchandise from American ports to China and returned laden with Chinese products for our markets. By 1852 more than 50 per cent of the foreign shipping entering the port of Shanghai was carried in American bottoms. You do not have to search very far back into the archives of Boston, Providence, New York, Baltimore, and Charleston to find interesting records of this old profitable trade between China and the young American Republic. And the trade was mutually satisfactory, of which fact there is ample evidence.

American firms occupied a leading position with their imposing office buildings and warehouses or "go-downs" in both Canton and Shanghai, and American shipping even had the lead on the China coast and on the Yangtze River. During this period of trade there were naturally many financial panics and we learn of many instances where the Chinese merchants in Canton extended credits to their American merchant friends and enabled them to pull through.

But this profitable trade with China and the Far East stopped at the beginning of our Civil War, which absorbed our entire interest and resources and enabled the development of the steamship in Europe to drive our sailing ships from the seas. In the long period from 1860 to the beginning of the European war, our commercial relations with China were small and never averaged much above \$50,000,000 a year for both imports and exports. Our chief concern was in the internal development of our own continent, and without a merchant marine there was little foreign commerce. Much of the commerce that we did have with China was handled for us by foreigners—the British and German, and later the Japanese. Who can see what

changes might have been wrought in the development of the Orient in this half century from 1860 to 1914 had we been able to maintain our commerce as it existed in the previous half century?

With the World War our trade with China and the Far East greatly increased, but we must remember that these were war times, when our European competitors were almost entirely out of the game. Germany, our chief competitor in machinery, was entirely out of the China market and we were able to absorb a good part of the trade that the German merchants formerly enjoyed. England, by an almost superhuman effort, was able to keep her trade alive in the essentials. We were handicapped at the beginning of the struggle by a scarcity of shipping. This was soon remedied. With the splendid ships that we now have upon the Pacific, and with the needed legislation, we have every reason to look to the future, so far as our trade with China and the Far East is concerned, with confidence.

In 1922 the United States enjoyed 16.11 per cent of China's total trade, as compared with 7.69 per cent in 1913. We sold China 17.33 per cent of her total imports from all countries in 1922, as against only 6.04 per cent in 1913. Our trade with China in 1922 was only exceeded by that of Japan and Hongkong. At least a quarter of the 25 per cent of China's trade attributed to Hongkong—which is merely a transshipment point—and of the 24 per cent of China's trade attributed to Japan was in reality American trade entering and leaving China by way of these places. It is estimated that at least 12 per cent more of China's trade than is shown by the direct trade is with the United States, so that the United States is really China's largest customer. China's principal imports, including machinery, iron and steel, cigarettes, kerosene, dyes and chemicals, wheat and flour, and leather goods are also the principal exports of the United States. In other words, the trade of the United States with China shows the following in figures:

	1921	1922	1923
Imports.....	\$112,658,000	\$151,975,000	\$211,818,000
Exports.....	132,331,000	126,998,000	134,881,000
Total.....	244,989,000	278,973,000	347,699,000
Per cent of total trade.....	.035	.04	.0437
Per cent of total imports.....	.045	.048	.058

On comparing our trade with some of the principal European countries with China, we find the following:

	1913	1922
Per cent of China's total trade with—		
Great Britain.....	10.29	16.39
United States.....	7.69	16.11
France.....	4.7	2.8
Germany.....	4.5	2
Per cent of China's imports with—		
United States.....	6.04	17.33
Great Britain.....	16.53	14.90
Germany.....	4.83	2.54

Hon. Herbert Hoover, the able Secretary of the Department of Commerce, has been doing much to improve our facilities and knowledge for increasing our trade with China. At the head of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is a very able man, Director Julius Klein. He has also given special attention to our trade with China. The American commercial attaché to China, as well as the registrar of the China trade act, trade commissioners, and so forth, all under Secretary Hoover and Director Klein, have been most helpful. I have never met a finer class of men in the foreign service. In addition to the Department of Commerce great assistance has been rendered by the Department of State through its diplomatic and consular officers. They are men able and painstaking, and are doing everything they can, not only to increase our trade with China but to maintain friendly and helpful relations with China. In the last appropriation bill we gave some increase to aid in this work in China under the Department of Commerce. In a recent hearing before the Appropriations Committee, in answer to a question by Chairman Shreve, Director Klein made, in part, the following statement touching the results accomplished:

There was a very considerable stimulus to the trade directly as the result of that work. The investigation, for example, of construction material trade, or the possibilities for construction material and machinery. Immediately, as the result of that appropriation, we sent

over an engineering expert who had had experience in the equipment of factories and buildings over there, and he has already facilitated a number of important orders which have come through.

We also provided in that appropriation for a very careful inspection of the situation at Canton. You will remember we were discussing the possibilities of a Canton office. As the result of that additional fund the commercial attaché and the trade commissioner accompanied the American minister on a recent tour through that southern district, and the plans have now been definitely made for that office, which will be open probably within a few weeks.

That survey was one of the most exhaustive economic inspections of this whole territory of South China, and it has a large number of unusually favorable angles from the American point of view.

As I understand it, there are a larger portion of young Chinese of American university training in that area than in any other area over there; furthermore, the intensive drive by our competitors in that part of China, in Hongkong and along the coast, is becoming more and more aggressive, and it is quite evident that the committee was wise in authorizing the expansion of the service in that direction.

Director Klein, in further testimony before the Appropriations Committee, being questioned concerning the China trade act, 1922, testified as follows:

At the present moment the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives is considering some very necessary amendments. The act passed by Congress last year has developed some very obvious defects. A number of companies have been incorporated under it, with a total capital of nearly \$3,000,000; but there has now come a need for a further modification of it, and that matter is in the hands of Congressman DYER, who is much interested in it. If the modification is effected, it is quite certain that there will be a large number of firms going in. It will interest the committee to know that already 160 firms are considering actively the possibilities of the act.

To date there have been nine companies granted certificates of incorporation. Of these, four have been capitalized in gold dollars with an issue of stock of \$1,056,650 gold paid in full. There have been five of the companies capitalized in Shanghai taels totaling Shanghai taels \$1,490,900, which would make a capital value of about \$1,128,275 gold. The above would total \$2,184,925 gold.

The companies so far have been very conservatively capitalized and the initial balance sheets as of the date of starting business will probably show a total capital stock value of close to \$2,750,000 for the nine concerns.

It is difficult to estimate the amount of business done, as none of the concerns have been in business over eight months of the year 1923 as China trade act corporations. It would appear, however, from preliminary information that the annual turnover of these corporations would at least equal their capital or will be approximately \$3,000,000 gold for the nine concerns which have incorporated under the China trade act to date.

Mr. Chairman, our relations with China since our first contact have been almost continuously peaceful and friendly. In the preamble of a treaty that we made with China on June 18, 1858, there were the following words:

They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause so as to produce an estrangement between them, and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively the United States will exert their good offices on being informed of the case to bring about an amicable arrangement of the questions, thus showing their friendly feelings.

This serves to show that Chinese-American relations are not of recent origin, but have existed on a friendly basis to the mutual advantage of the two peoples during practically the entire national life of the United States.

It is impossible to place your finger upon any one single element that has been responsible for this general prestige and friendship that exists in China toward this country or the similar feeling that exists over here toward the Chinese people. It has stood the test of time, and as a Nation we have been a pretty good sport in our relations with China, a weaker power. We have never as a Government participated in the territorial aggressions which have been the established customs on the part of both Europe and Japan. We have never supported our citizens in obtaining monopolies or exclusive spheres of influence upon the continent of Asia. We have never participated with other powers in infringements upon Chinese administrative autonomy except to a limited extent necessary to prevent us from being thrown out of her markets entirely by our competitors, and in these cases our influence has always been exerted to the benefit of China rather than to ourselves.

The Chinese are a splendid people; they are industrious; they have a vast country, rich in its resources. As a nation and as a people they will become great and powerful in commerce and otherwise. They must be given time to work this out themselves with their own leaders, of whom they have

many splendid ones, able and honest. This class predominates and will soon have firmly the reins of government. Tsao Kun, the new President of China, according to those who know him, is straightforward. Tsao Kun was elected President last fall by parliament to succeed Li Yuan-hung.

Tsao Kun is 60 years of age. Thirty-five years ago he was a common soldier. An officer, attracted by his qualities of leadership, had him sent to a military school. After graduation he directed a training school for soldiers of the old Manchu court.

In 1911 he aided in suppressing the first revolution in Chihli Province. In 1915 he offered unsuccessful opposition to Gen. Tsao Ao, the restorer of the republic, who was fighting the imperialistic movement of Yuan Shih-kai.

Tsao Kun then was made military governor of Chihli. In 1917 he was commander of the troops of several Provinces in the war against the south.

So far as their internal and sovereign problems are concerned, no nation or people can do China any good in this regard by interfering. The world must recognize the "open door" for China proclaimed by John Hay in the fall of 1899, and indorsed and ratified by the American people many times. We want to see China become the great republic of the east as we are of the west.

The Chinese have had, and will continue to have for some years to come, great difficulties in making their people into a great unified nation. Their history of thousands of years need not be studied to understand their difficulties in the new situation that has come to them in changing their form of Government. I have studied the Chinese people, their country, opportunities for rendering them assistance in commerce, and in other ways during my visits there, and my judgment is that we should relieve China of its financial debts to other nations and assume them all ourselves and arrange a just plan for China to pay us. China could then go ahead more rapidly and get rid of her financial troubles. One of the wrongs done China was the exacting from her of an immense amount of money as indemnities for the so-called Boxer uprising. She has been paying off this debt year by year. It has been one of the causes of her poor financial situation. A great part of this debt was not actual damages done to foreigners, but was what is known as punitive damages. The United States, as well as all other countries that are yet unpaid a portion of these indemnities, should remit them. This country did remit a portion of its indemnity some years ago, and we should cancel the balance of it, as well as return to China that which we have collected over and above the actual damages and expenses sustained by our people. We should urge other nations to do the same. China has many splendid men working faithfully and honestly for the salvation of the country. They should have our hearty good will and active support. I recently received a letter from an American official who has been in China for a long time and who knows the Chinese people. He writes me as follows:

As I view China, the forces which are working beneath the surface in this country will have to be accorded sufficient time to make themselves a commanding factor in the situation. There is no mistaking the fact that the thinking people of China have changed during the past few decades from a mental attitude of self-sufficiency to one of receptivity to influences from without. Contact with the West, physical and mental, has been responsible for this. As a result their society to-day is undergoing probably the most important transition in its entire history of 4,000 years. In adjusting themselves to changing conceptions in the economic, social, and political phases of their society, they are confronted with problems the gravity of which is accentuated by the vast area of the country, the tremendous population involved, the decades and centuries of traditions differentiating them from any other peoples, and last but not least, bad internal communications. To develop from a *laissez faire* society, which characterized China for decades, into a modern organized state with representative government will require time. The forces working beneath the surface are of such a nature and of such proportions that I believe the Chinese people will succeed in this task.

There is no disputing the fact that during the past 20 years the Chinese have made tremendous strides toward the development of a national spirit. An educated public opinion is gradually becoming manifest. They have reformed and modernized their educational system. The country is undergoing a literary renaissance. There are also evidences of a spiritual reawakening on the part of the Chinese people.

The Chinese now appreciate the necessity of railways and modern means of communication. No country is in greater need of modern transportation than is China. Industry and business are being reorganized in China along modern lines. It is not strange that, under the conditions which have existed in this country, government, in the sense in which it is appreciated in the west, should be slow of develop-



ment. Personally, I am not at all pessimistic as to the future of China or the Chinese people. The developments which have taken their inception during the past few decades have progressed in such a way that one should, rightly speaking, be optimistic. The pessimists in China to-day are those who lack a sense of proportion or fail to comprehend the situation in its perspective.

It must be borne in mind that, fundamentally, conditions in this country are sound. The Peking Government may be bankrupt or nearly so, yet the fact remains the country has continued during all these decades and centuries on a specie basis, and the resources of China are such that if they are marshaled and organized they can be made to meet all the financial requirements in connection with the Government's obligations, and provide for an extensive program of development. The per capita debt of the nation is small, ridiculously so when compared with that of certain European countries to-day. Intellectually and physically the Chinese people possess the potentialities of any other people in the world.

We can help the Chinese most when we help them to help themselves. In my opinion we shall be doing more for China and the Chinese people when we devise ways and means of helping them to improve their economic conditions, for I believe that China's ills to-day are more economic than political. Thus we shall strike at the root of the needs of these people when we tackle its economic problems.

It has been stated, and probably in truth, that there are in China to-day upward of 1,000,000 men under arms. There are a number of military Tsuchuns, or feudal overlords, in power, each claiming independent supremacy in certain regions and holding this power through their military organizations. To disband the armies of these military Tsuchuns is China's present pressing problem. The great bulk of these soldiers are following this activity from necessity rather than choice. The bandits and brigands in China are the results of bad economic conditions. It will be practical to disband these troops when means of employment are devised which will make it possible for these hundreds of thousands of men to secure a living by following peaceful pursuits. If they are disbanded without according them means of employment, they may break up into small bands, and we shall have disorganized disorder rather than the present what may be called organized disorder. The Chinese are naturally a peaceful and industrious people, and it should not be difficult to impress the soldiers of to-day into constructive employment if a practical plan could be devised whereby avenues for honest labor were opened.

In an economic way China needs railways to the extent of tens of thousands of miles. Railways will open vast areas of unsettled, undeveloped lands to cultivation, thereby relieving the congestion of population in other sections. They will also connect the populated regions with new markets, thereby increasing the wealth of this region. Conservancy, good roads, reclamation work, etc., abound in potentialities in the employment of labor and the development of resources. If American finance would come to China to the aid of its economic conditions more could be done for the future of these peoples and at the same time assist our trade and commerce in this wonderful section of the world than probably could be accomplished in any other way. A constructive program of financial assistance, working in cooperation with the Chinese business men and bankers, is in my opinion possible of consummation. It may be advisable to do this work on an international basis, if the cooperation of other nations could be enlisted in a helpful sense. Constructive assistance of this character would also do much to effect a consolidation and union of the various contending factions.

Mr. Chairman, what I have read to the House is the judgment of an American of 20 years' residence in China. Now, let me present the views of a Chinese regarding his own people.

Among the splendid Chinese whom I have met and learned to know and admire immensely is the Chinese Minister to the United States, Sao-Ke Alfred Sze. In a recent speech touching the Chinese he said, in part:

We are a people who, of all living races, go farthest back into the past. We were a nation long before the Roman set foot in England. For more than 20 centuries we were living in the valleys of our great rivers before the English entered Thames Valley. And the whole of Europe was pagan when Confucianism was already, for more than 500 years, a living creed and a social code in our midst. The peoples and the races who were our contemporaries in those distant days have all disappeared into the night of the past. But we survive. And we survive, not as a dying race, but as a great coherent body of 400,000,000 people. And note this fact: Whilst we are the oldest living race on earth, our mind possesses a vitality and elasticity which has enabled us to adopt the most advanced forms of parliamentary government—namely, republicanism.

What is the reason for this survival—for this passage of the Chinese people, as a living nation, through the ages? It is, no doubt, difficult to explain a great historical fact like this in terms of a single cause. But I suggest that it is largely to be explained by Chinese adaptability—by the capacity of the Chinese to respond to

the demands of change and adapt and readjust themselves to any new environment in which they may find themselves.

This, perhaps, may sound strange to those who have always been told that China is changeless. But this is a saying that is not only untrue but full of mischief. It is mischievous because it causes people to think that the present state of China, with its unrest and disarray, is due entirely to the incapacity of her people to adapt themselves to the new conditions of life which foreign pressure and influence have set up around them. And from this belief you get that very sinister view which would see China, with her illimitable man power and vast natural resources, placed under the tutelage of some other state inspired with a greater will power.

It is, no doubt, true that there exists a certain degree of unrest and political disturbance in China to-day. But it is very important to realize that this is a state of things which occurs and has occurred in every country where a new system of government or some other fundamental change in the life of a people has taken place. You see this fact of unrest and disorder in nearly every country in Europe to-day. The Great War has released ideas and forces which go to the foundation of what is called the European system. And there are observers who hold that this period of unrest and disturbance will continue for at least a generation. It is argued that a new system of life is being introduced into Europe, and until you have bred and trained new men to work this new system the men trained under the old dispensation must go on with the task of government. And, it is added, as it is impossible to have the new system properly worked by these men, a period of disturbance must ensue and continue pending the appearance of the new workers.

Twenty-five hundred years ago Confucius defined this same problem of government. "Let there be the men," the sage said, "and government will flourish; but without the men government decays. With the right men the growth of government is rapid, just as vegetation is rapid in the earth. Therefore the administration of government lies in getting proper men."

Whether this Confucian view of the European situation is sound or not, there can be no doubt that we are faced in China with the same sort of problem which seems to confront Europe. And most Chinese who think over the matter believe its solution lies in the direction indicated by the master. Up to the date of the Chinese revolution in 1911-12 China was ruled by an autocracy. The revolution destroyed the autocratic system of government and replaced it by a democratic system. This point was emphasized some little time ago by a Chinese publicist in one of the daily papers in London. China, he said, is now passing through a period of transition and is adjusting a system of government created under autocracy into a democratic system.

Under autocracy the country was considered the property of the ruler, whereas now it is regarded as the common possession of the Nation. And he went on to point out that the present difficulties in China were largely due to the inevitable disorganization caused by this transition. To work the democratic principle you must have the necessary machinery in the form of parliamentary institutions; and this machine has hitherto been worked by men trained under the old system of government, because the country must be governed in one way or another, even if mistakes are made. And he insisted that in every instance where a nation had passed through a fundamental change there had always been a period of unrest and disturbance, which was but an expression of the nation's efforts to adjust its old life to the conditions and demands of a new environment.

This view of the situation in China implies that the present political and economic difficulties of the country are not the outcome of racial incapacity or faults of character, but the marks and signs of a period of transition. In other words, these difficulties are the surface effects of the great movement of life that is daily changing the whole face of China. They are signs of vitality, not of decay.

Mr. Chairman, China is the only great undeveloped country in the world. It is rich in resources and man power. Shall we take our proper part for the good of the United States and China?

We of this country who do not look to the opportunity that is ours in China to participate in its great commerce and trade development for the present and the future are unfaithful to the great destiny of the American people. With legislation that will remove our technical handicaps, most Americans familiar with present developments in the Orient believe that we may in a comparatively few years take a position of commanding influence for our own and China's good and benefit.

One of the best authorities on America's future as to commerce in the Pacific, and especially China, is Capt. Robert Dollar, the head of the Robert Dollar Co. In a recent statement upon this subject he said:

Few as yet recognize the great field for foreign trade afforded by China. Take the Province of Szechuen, for instance. Formerly only junks, hauled by 120 men, penetrated into it. Our passenger steamers now go as far as Chung-King, 1,600 miles inland from the ocean, but

the Province, with its population of 70,000,000, is not yet open to foreign trade.

Formerly China bought all her cotton piece goods from Great Britain and the United States. Now she has a number of mills scattered all over the country and is manufacturing much of her own cotton goods. She wants to use her other raw materials. The Chinese people are very eager for trade, and particularly with the United States, whose friendship and good will they prize highly.

We have passed the period when jackknife swapping among ourselves was sufficient. We need all possible trade with other nations. We produce and manufacture more than we need, probably 33½ per cent more. Let that 33½ per cent of excess manufactures and products go out and bring back gold; if not gold, raw materials which we use for more manufactures, and that adds to the country's wealth.

To make foreign trade profitable in the shipping business we must have return cargoes. To-day there are large numbers of ships lying idle because they can not get such cargoes. When we take lumber out and can find no return cargo let us buy commodities to bring back.

I remember some years ago—12 or 13, I think—wading ashore to one of the islands of the Philippines to look into the lumber possibilities. We were over there without a return cargo and were desperately in need of one. I found copra. As that was the only possible cargo in sight I set about getting it. But as this was the first shipment of copra to the west coast I had to promise, on contract, to deliver 12,000 tons a year for three years to get it.

I took the chance, and the copra and coconut-oil business grew rapidly to an annual value of \$22,000,000.

What Capt. Robert Dollar and his splendid sons and associates have done to build trade for America in the Pacific, and especially in China, has been and can be done by many others. Give to Americans an equal opportunity with all other nationals in China and we will forge far ahead in trade and in commerce. This country is now producing much more than it needs for its own use. We must find foreign markets. China has more than 400,000,000 of people to purchase from us. We in this country can use much that China has and produces. We should build factories and mills in China with American and Chinese capital, to be operated under American and Chinese management for the joint benefit of the people of both countries. Our engineers, with American and Chinese money, should help to develop the resources of China and build its railroads, so as to bring its products and resources to the markets of China and the world. The problems of China are the problems of America. When we build the Panama Canal we brought China closer to the United States. President Roosevelt, when he made the proposal for the construction of that canal, said:

The Mediterranean era died with the discovery of America. The Atlantic era is now at the height of its development and must soon exhaust the resources at its command. The Pacific era, destined to be the greatest of all, is just at its dawn.

Some 60 years before this former Secretary of State Seward, when Alaska was added to the United States, said:

The Pacific Ocean, its islands, and its vast regions beyond will become the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter.

The Pacific era is here; the Pacific Ocean is at our doors; China is our friend and our neighbor, and the Congress of the United States, its Government, and its people should take heed of these prophetic warnings and fast make ready to take our place and do our part in the development of China for American trade as well as render to its people every needed assistance that will redound to the good of China and our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8233 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. HAWES, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, for 10 days, on account of important business.

Mr. SINCLAIR, for 10 days, on account of death in family.

Mr. CROSSER, for to-day, on account of illness.

#### MINORITY VIEWS—TEACHERS' SALARY BILL.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file minority views on the teachers' salary bill which comes up on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### REREFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the chairman of the Committee on the Territories have agreed to a rereference of the bill H. R. 7407 from the Committee on the Territories to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I inquire if the Chair agrees that the reference is proper?

The SPEAKER. The Chair assumed that when the two chairmen agreed to it that would be sufficient.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would be very persuasive.

The SPEAKER. The bill is to extend the Federal farm loan act to Hawaii and Alaska and was originally referred to the Committee on the Territories. Without objection, it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

419. A letter from the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting tenth annual report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for the year 1923; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

420. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize major alterations to certain naval vessels"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

421. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment of the United States, for maintenance Senate Office Building, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, in the sum of \$24,405 (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 184. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (minority views, part 2, of Rept. No. 395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Elections No. 2. Claim of E. W. Cole for a seat in the House of Representatives as a Representative at Large from the State of Texas (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7113. A bill to establish a dairy bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 189. A joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to participate in a World's Poultry Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. J. Res. 52. A joint resolution for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. J. Res. 77. A joint resolution authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference, to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924; with amendments (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FAIRCHILD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. J. Res. 79. A joint resolution to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City beginning March 27, 1924; with amendments (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on the Census. H. J. Res. 231. A joint resolution directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places; without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8050. A bill to detach Reagan County, in the State of Texas, from the El Paso division of the western judicial district of Texas, and attach said county to the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 113. A bill changing the name of Keokuk Street, in the county of Washington, D. C., to Military Road; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6498. A bill for the relief of May Adelaide Sharp; with an amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 222. A joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7407) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide additional credit facilities for the agricultural and livestock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act; and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923: Committee on the Territories discharged, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (H. R. 4745) granting a pension to Dennis B. Lucey; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5855) granting a pension to William P. A. Fitzjohn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 8303) authorizing the building of a bridge across the Pee Dee River at or near Allison's Ferry, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8304) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One Hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 8305) to regulate the use by vehicles of the streets, alleys, and public places within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 8306) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, and June 26, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 8307) to provide for an investigation and study of fungus diseases in redwood forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8308) authorizing the Coast and Geodetic Survey to make seismological investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 240) providing for the employment of a substitute telephone operator when required; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 8309) granting an increase of pension to William A. Salmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 8310) granting a pension to Edward Zechman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 8311) for the relief of Margaret Sheehan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8312) granting an increase of pension to Olive Newhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 8313) granting a pension to Margary Dotter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8314) granting an increase of pension to Clementine N. Julian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8315) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Richard F. Pellett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8316) granting a pension to Judah Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 8317) granting a pension to Mary E. Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of Peter Shell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 8319) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8320) granting a pension to Annie E. Fryer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8321) granting an increase of pension to Anne Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 8322) for the relief of John H. Gonderman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8323) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8324) granting a pension to Delphina E. Blackwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8325) granting a pension to Benjamin F. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 8326) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the lawful heirs of Matilda Picotte; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8327) granting a pension to Armina Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8328) for the relief of James Minon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 8329) for the relief of Albert S. Matlock; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petition and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2072. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of the Garibaldi Club of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2073. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of the Woman's Reading and Social Club, of Almont, Mich., urging adoption of the resolution to send an American representative to the forthcoming international narcotic conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2074. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Boston Central Labor Union, Boston, Mass., urging immediate modification of the Volstead enforcement law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2075. Also, petition of Eliot School Alumni Association, Boston, Mass., protesting against the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2076. Also, petition of Michael Donohoe, national president Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, protesting against report of H. H. Laughlin, delegated by the Carnegie Foundation to seek information for a congressional committee on immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2077. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Noble County, Okla., urging the passage of the educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

2078. Also, petition of citizens of Noble County, Okla., urging the passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2079. Also, petition of a number of wheat growers at Ceres (eighth congressional district), Okla., indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill and urging that farm relief provided for in this bill be furnished; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2080. Also, petition of a number of wheat growers of Billings, Okla., indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill and urging that farm relief provided for in this bill be furnished; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2081. By Mr. MORTON D. HULL (by request): Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2082. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Hawaii, in session assembled on March 10, 1924, indorsing the joint resolution introduced by Congressman Celler, proposing the adoption of the "Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem; to the Committee on the Library.

2083. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of several residents of Erie County, N. Y., urging the adoption of the Anthony bill (H. R. 745) creating public shooting grounds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2084. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Martha Francis and other citizens of Minneapolis, urging the defeat of any measure proposed to modify the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2085. By Mr. SITES: Petition of Central Democratic Club, 213 Walnut Street, Harrisburg, Pa., urging a more liberal interpretation of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2086. Also, petition of Division No. 459, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Harrisburg, Pa., urging the early enactment into law of the Howell-Barkley bill (S. 2646, H. R. 7358) to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2087. Also, petition of Division No. 414, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Lebanon, Pa., urging the early enactment into law of the Howell-Barkley bill (S. 2646, H. R. 7358) to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2088. Also, petition of citizens of the nineteenth district of Pennsylvania, urging drastic restriction of immigration, and that the quota of 1890 be used as a basis for determining the number of aliens to be admitted from each country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2089. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Indiana County Medical Society, Indiana, Pa., opposed to legislation that will prohibit the manufacture or importation of heroin in the United States for use by reputable physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2090. By Mr. WELSH: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of House bill 4, being an act to prevent interstate sale of fraudulent securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2091. By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: Petition of 10 citizens of Evansville, Ind., urging the restriction of immigration and favoring the passage of the Johnson immigration bill based on the census of 1890; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 31, 1924.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou who art the God of hope and who desires for us that we may be filled with joy and peace in believing, and abound in hope, we pray Thee that this morning we may look out upon a world bettered in many conditions, elevating our thoughts in the highest degree of glad expectation, believing that Thou wilt lead us even when darkness seems to gather about us. Help us, Father, to see Thy face, to believe in Thy promises, and to labor hopefully for gracious results. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### REPORT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of the Federal Reserve Board, covering operations for the year 1923, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### DETAIL OF OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the communication from the President of the United States, relative to the temporary Executive detail, in the public interest, of officers of the United States subject to Executive control, which was received on the 26th instant and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as Senate Document No. 79. It should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the communication will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania presented a memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, remonstrating against the passage of House bill 4, to prevent the interstate sale of fraudulent securities, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LADD presented the petition of Mrs. Edith Ford and 36 other members of the Farm Bureau Club, of Ashtabulah, Barnes County, N. Dak., praying for the passage of legislation leasing the Muscle Shoals plant to Henry Ford, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a telegram from J. D. Eldridge, secretary and general manager Arkansas Cotton Growers' Cooperative Association, of Little Rock, Ark., urging that a recount to date be made by the Government of cotton held in mills and warehouses and an estimate of the number of bales on farms, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Harmony Lodge, No. 114, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, of North Little Rock, Ark., praying for the passage of legislation repealing or amending the transportation act of 1920, especially the rate-making and labor provisions, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of McGehee Lodge, No. 104, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, of McGehee, Ark., praying for the passage of Senate bill 2646, to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WILLIS presented petitions, numerous signed, by over 1,200 citizens in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution of Dayton Post, No. 5, the American Legion, of Dayton, Ohio, favoring adequate appropriations for the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of D. W. Smith and sundry other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Emory Windle and sundry other citizens of Amlin, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called truth-in-fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Federation of Women's Clubs, of Lima, Ohio, favoring representation of the United States at the forthcoming international conference for the suppression of the narcotic traffic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Political Association of Train Service Organizations, and their auxiliaries of the sixteenth congressional district of Ohio, at Canton, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation granting adjusted compensation to veterans of the World War, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John Shackelford and 39 other citizens of Leesburg, Ohio, praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the East Side Commercial Club, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution of Rushcreek Grange, No. 2149, of Bremen, Fairfield County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation leasing the Muscle Shoals plant to Henry Ford,